

244115

JPRS 83684

15 June 1983

USSR Report

TRANSLATIONS FROM KOMMUNIST

No. 6, April 1983

Reproduced From
Best Available Copy

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A
Approved for Public Release
Distribution Unlimited

19991008 084



FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

REPRODUCED BY
**NATIONAL TECHNICAL
INFORMATION SERVICE**
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
SPRINGFIELD, VA 22161

4
161
A08

NOTE

JPRS publications contain information primarily from foreign newspapers, periodicals and books, but also from news agency transmissions and broadcasts. Materials from foreign-language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed or reprinted, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [] are supplied by JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpt] in the first line of each item, or following the last line of a brief, indicate how the original information was processed. Where no processing indicator is given, the information was summarized or extracted.

Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically or transliterated are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear in the original but have been supplied as appropriate in context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by source.

The contents of this publication in no way represent the policies, views or attitudes of the U.S. Government.

PROCUREMENT OF PUBLICATIONS

JPRS publications may be ordered from the National Technical Information Service (NTIS), Springfield, Virginia 22161. In ordering, it is recommended that the JPRS number, title, date and author, if applicable, of publication be cited.

Current JPRS publications are announced in Government Reports Announcements issued semimonthly by the NTIS, and are listed in the Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

Correspondence pertaining to matters other than procurement may be addressed to Joint Publications Research Service, 1000 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Virginia 22201.

Soviet books and journal articles displaying a copyright notice are reproduced and sold by NTIS with permission of the copyright agency of the Soviet Union. Permission for further reproduction must be obtained from copyright owner.

B1 - CONTROL NUMBER: U244115
B4 - ACCESSION NUMBER:JPRS-83684
B3 - COLLECTION CODE: 3
B6 - MANAGEMENT CODE: XR
B7 - PROCESS ACTNG CD: 01 B7A-REGISTRATION FEE: 00000
B8 - PRODUCT MANAGER: H
B9 - RECEIPT TYPE: 1 B9A-LOAN DUE OUT:
B10- TRANSACTION: TN B10A-DUPE/PRIOR/SUPER:
B12- RETURNS: 0 B12A-RETURN DATE:
B13- PROCESSING: 1
B14- PAT. POTENTIAL: 0
B17- FORM/PRICE: 12002 ,
B18- ANNOUNCE: 0000
B19- PUBLICATION-1: u8326 B20- PUBLICATION-2:
B21- LIMITATION: 0
B23- PC BIN: 000
B24- STOCK: 0004 B24A-STOCK TYPE CODES: D
B25- PAGES/SHEETS: 00161
B26- PC PRICE CODE: A08
B27- DOMESTIC PRICE: 0000000 B28- FOREIGN PRICE: 0000000
B29- ACTION CODES: SS
B33- MN PRICE CODE: X00
B34- DOMESTIC PRICE: 0000000 B35- FOREIGN PRICE: 0000000
B36- ACTION CODES: XM
B37- RELEASEABILITY CD: A
B38- MF PRINT: D
B39- ADDITIONAL INFO: n
B40- PRINT PC: n
B41- PC DUE: n
B42- SOURCE ORDER: n
B42A-GENERATE RDP: 0
B42B-SUPPLIER SRC CD: n
@06)USSR Report, Translations from Kabbal
ommunist, No. 6, April 1983.[@@@
@11)15 Jun 83,[@@@

15 June 1983

USSR REPORT
TRANSLATIONS FROM KOMMUNIST

No 6, April 1983

Translations from the Russian-language theoretical organ of the CPSU Central Committee published in Moscow (18 issues per year).

CONTENTS

Eightieth Anniversary of the Second RSDWP Congress.....	1
V. I. Lenin and the Foreign Policy of the Soviet State (A. Gromyko).....	10
Karl Marx and the Universal-Historical Process of the Liberation of Man (V. Zagladin, S. Men'shikov and I. Frolov).....	35
V. I. Lenin: 'These Are the Lofty Tasks of Which I Am Dreaming...' (V. Chikin).....	53
The Leninist Ethics of Bolshevism.....	65
On the Main Direction (V. Kabaidze).....	76
Terrestrial Cosmonautics Program (V. Mishin).....	90
Laos: The Maturing of the Revolution (V. Kadulin).....	102
Plans and Deeds of Newfangled 'Crusaders' (L. Tolkunov).....	117
'His Entire Spirit Turned to the Homeland...' (V. Popov).....	129
Fundamental Issue of Party Work.....	136

Leninist Foundations of the Organization of the State of the Whole People (G. Ostroumov).....	143
For a Party Literature (V. Ozerov).....	147
History of Sociology and Ideological Struggle (A. Teyev).....	150
Bookshelf.....	154

PUBLICATION DATA

English title : TRANSLATION FROM KOMMUNIST, No 6
April 1983

Russian title : KOMMUNIST

Author (s) :

Editor (s) : R. I. Kosolapov

Publishing House : Izdatel'stvo "PRAVDA"

Place of Publication : Moscow

Date of Publication : April 1983

Signed to press : 12 April 83

Copies : 857,000

COPYRIGHT : Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda",
"Kommunist", 1983

EIGHTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF THE SECOND RSDWP CONGRESS

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 6, Apr 83 pp 3-10

[CPSU Central Committee 31 March 1983 Decree]

[Text] The Second RSDWP Congress, at which the Bolshevik Party was founded, opened 80 years ago, on 30 July 1903. The congress completed the process of unification of the revolutionary Marxist organizations in Russia on the basis of the ideological, political and organizational principles developed by Vladimir Il'ich Lenin. A party of a new type -- of the working class, scientific communism, socialist revolution and communist building -- appeared in the historical arena.

The founding of the Leninist party was the legitimate result of social development. It became the turning point in the liberation struggle waged by the Russian and international proletariat. By the turn of the century capitalism had entered its imperialist stage which had aggravated to the extreme all socioeconomic contradictions. The latter were manifested with exceptional strength in Russia, where they were worsened by the political, spiritual and national oppression of tsarism. The center of the world revolutionary movement shifted to Russia. The working class was rising in the struggle against the bourgeois-landowning system, and the activities of the toiling peasantry were intensifying. Marxism was rapidly spreading throughout the country with the tangible help of the "Liberation of Labor" group. The tasks of unifying the labor movement with scientific socialism triggered the objective need for a proletarian revolution.

The creation of the party is inseparable from the tremendous theoretical and practical activities of V. I. Lenin, the brilliant philosopher and follower and perpetuator of the great accomplishment of K. Marx and F. Engels. He developed their theory in accordance with the age of imperialism and proletarian revolutions and reached the conclusion that socialism could win initially in a single country. On the basis of summations and comprehensive study he answered the basic questions facing the liberation movement of the working class. While surmounting the stubborn opposition of opportunism and reformism, V. I. Lenin scientifically proved the need for a truly revolutionary party and headed the struggle for its establishment.

The "Union of Struggle for the Liberation of the Working Class," which Lenin had founded in 1895, became the embryo of that party. The First RSDWP

Congress, which was held in 1898, had proclaimed the founding of the party, but had been unable to establish it as a unified centralized organization. The second congress, organized by Lenin's ISKRA, equally failed. "Bolshevism," V. I. Lenin pointed out, "exists as a current of political thinking and as a political party since 1903" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 41, p 6).

The Bolshevik Party was fundamentally different from the parties of the Second International, which were incapable of revolutionary action. The characteristic features and specifics of the party of a new type, inherent in it from its beginning and which crystallized in the course of its further development, are the following:

It is guided by Marxist-Leninist doctrine which it developed creatively, ensuring the organic unity between revolutionary theory and revolutionary practice;

It is the collective political leader of the working class, a higher form of its organization and the vanguard of all working people. Its closest possible ties with the masses are the source of its inexhaustible strength;

It structures its activities on the basis of democratic centralism, tirelessly strengthening ideological and organizational unity and conscious discipline, within its ranks and develops the activeness of the party members;

It is intolerant of any factionalism and cliquishness and manifestations of revisionism, opportunism and dogmatism;

It critically analyzes the results of its revolutionary-transforming activities and policies, and continuously studies, evaluates and utilizes the experience acquired by the international communist movement;

It systematically implements the principles of proletarian internationalism.

Armed with the theory of Marxism-Leninism, the Bolshevik Party headed the liberation struggle of the proletariat and its allies in the three Russian revolutions and led the toiling masses to the victorious October Revolution. The Great October Socialist Revolution marked a radical turn in the historical destinies of mankind and inaugurated a new era: the era of transition from capitalism to socialism.

The victory of the socialist revolution faced the party with the tasks of building and defending the first state of workers and peasants in the world, the state of proletarian dictatorship. After defeating the combined forces of the domestic counterrevolution and international imperialism, and victoriously ending the civil war, the Soviet people, headed by the communist party, engaged in tremendous efforts to implement the Leninist plan for building socialism. Under conditions marked by dislocation and economic and political blockade imposed by the capitalist countries, the working people in the land of the soviets carried out radical changes such as socialist industrialization, agricultural collectivization and the cultural revolution. The founding of the USSR, and the comprehensive upsurge of the economy and culture of all

nations and nationalities in the country, marked the triumph of the ideas of proletarian internationalism.

Socialism was built in the USSR as a result of the revolutionary-transforming activities of the party and the people. For the first time in the history of mankind the new system established public ownership of productive capital, and put an end to class and national antagonisms, exploitation and unemployment. It brought real freedom and made available to the working people the achievements of material and spiritual culture. The moral and political unity of the people was established and Marxism-Leninism became the dominant ideology of Soviet society after the completion of the transitional period from capitalism to socialism and the consolidation of the socialist way of life. Relations of equality, collectivism and comradely mutual aid were established.

During the harsh period of the Great Patriotic War the party inspired and organized the nationwide struggle against the German-fascist aggressors. Under its leadership the Soviet people won a historical victory and saved the peoples of the world from the danger of fascist slavery. During the postwar period, the country rapidly healed the deep wounds of the war and achieved new outstanding economic and cultural successes.

The building of developed socialism in the USSR is the main result of the constructive activities of the Soviet people under the guidance of the communist party. Our country is starting this legitimate and historically lengthy period in the establishment of a communist system. The main purpose of the activities of the party and the people today is to improve developed socialism, which will gradually lead to communism. This presumes the further upsurge in production forces and the development and strengthening of collectivist social relations, Soviet statehood and democracy, and socialist consciousness, science and culture. The party points out the need for our society to be seen in its actual dynamics and for an accurate assessment of its accomplishments, problems, possibilities and needs.

The 26th CPSU Congress defined the tasks for the 11th Five-Year Plan and the 1980s as a whole. It focused its attention on pursuing the course of upgrading social production efficiency and intensification. Particular attention is ascribed to the all-round acceleration of the pace of scientific and technical progress, a reduction in manual labor, the economical and efficient utilization of all resources, and higher capital returns.

The decisions of the May 1982 CPSU Central Committee Plenum and the Food Program mark a new stage in the party's contemporary agrarian policy. A deeper change is taking place in all economic sectors in resolving the problem of the further enhancement of agricultural production, the development of the agroindustrial complex and ensuring the uninterrupted supply of the population with foodstuffs.

While giving due credit for successes, the party can also see the shortcomings in the development of the national economy and is mobilizing the working people for their elimination. The resolutions of the November 1982 CPSU Central Committee Plenum and the speech by Yu. V. Andropov, CPSU Central Committee general secretary, provide a profound study of the status of the

economy, identify reserves and indicate ways for the solution of ripe problems. They emphasize the exceptional importance of the growth of labor productivity which, as V. I. Lenin said, is, in the final account, the most important, the main feature which will ensure the victory of the new social system. Prime attention is being paid to the further development of industry, its basic sectors in particular: the fuel and energy complex, railroad transportation, ferrous metallurgy and capital construction. The task is to ensure the fuller satisfaction of the population with industrial and comestible goods. The efforts to improve the entire area of economic management -- administration, planning and economic mechanism -- must be speeded up.

The supreme objective of socialist production is the steady enhancement of the living standard of the people and the creation of conditions for the all-round development of the individual. Concern for the good of the Soviet person has been and remains our party's general line. The CPSU is pursuing a course of steady improvement of material and moral incentives and encourages the systematic assertion of the socialist distribution principles, pointing out that wages can be raised only on the basis of a faster growth of labor productivity. The struggle against unconscious attitude toward the work, parasitism, unearned income and other phenomena alien to our system is ascribed essential significance. The party emphasizes that labor and its results must be the only sources of the well-being of the individual.

The fulfillment of the party's tasks requires increased responsibility on the part of the working people -- from worker to minister -- for assignments, for bringing order and organization on all economic levels and strengthening planning, labor and state discipline. This calls for the application of a progressive labor organization and wage methods, the extensive dissemination of progressive experience and a more efficient socialist competition.

An objective process of rapprochement among all classes and social groups is taking place in the country. The party and the state are helping to strengthen social homogeneity. They are pursuing a systematic course toward the further elimination of the major disparities between town and country and mental and physical labor. Having assessed the experience gained in the development of our society, the CPSU drew the scientific conclusion that the establishment of a classless social structure will take place in its main and essential aspects within the historical framework of mature socialism.

Lenin's party is justifiably proud of achievements in the field of national relations. The national problem, as we inherited it from the exploiting system, has been resolved irreversibly once and for all. For the first time in the history of the multinational structure of the country it has turned from a source of weakness into one of power and prosperity. The establishment and development of a new historical community -- the Soviet people -- became a superior manifestation of the social and international unity of society. The celebration of the 60th anniversary of the USSR developed into a vivid demonstration of the unbreakable unity among fraternal peoples.

The development of a large multinational state such as ours creates new processes and problems which demand close attention. The CPSU ensures the systematic advancement of production forces within the framework of the single

union-wide national economic complex. It concerns itself with the growth of the national detachments of the working class and the proper representation of the working people of all nations in party and state organs. It educates the Soviet people in a spirit of friendship and fraternity among nations and love for their single Soviet homeland.

The systematic development of socialist democracy is an important prerequisite for our social progress. The growth of the state of dictatorship of the proletariat into a socialist state of the whole people was a tremendously important change in terms of the development of the socialist and democratic political system. The new USSR Constitution established the legislative base for the intensification of Soviet democracy and the enrichment of its means and methods. The party is purposefully involving the broadest possible masses in the management of state and social affairs, and enhancing the activeness of the soviets of people's deputies, the trade unions, the Komsomol, the other public organizations and the labor collectives in resolving national economic and social problems. Measures are being taken to strengthen law and order.

The party's guiding activities are having a beneficial influence on the spiritual life of Soviet society. The conversion to universal secondary education of the youth has been completed. A uniform system of higher, secondary specialized and vocational-technical training has been created, which essentially supplies the national economy with skilled specialist and worker cadres. Reliance on science and strengthening its ties with production and its conversion into a direct productive force are characteristic features of our time.

The party is concerned with the development of socialist culture and encourages men of literature and the arts to create highly artistic works imbued with the spirit of party-and national-mindedness. It actively involves the broadest possible masses in cultural construction and helps to discover the people's capabilities and gifts.

In strengthening the material and spiritual foundations of the socialist way of life, the CPSU is steadily resolving the problem of shaping in the members of society a Marxist-Leninist outlook, loyalty to the ideals of communism, a feeling of ownership of the country, political and moral standards and intolerance of bourgeois ideology and morality. Efforts are made to upgrade the ideological, theoretical and organizational standards of political and educational activities and to strengthen its ties with life. The party sees the way to improving propaganda, which must always be truthful and realistic, interesting and intelligible and, therefore, more efficient, in convincingly displaying our achievements, seriously analyzing new problems and coming up with original thoughts and actions.

Our people justifiably relate all their accomplishments to the comprehensive activities of the CPSU -- the leading and guiding force in Soviet society, and the nucleus of its political system. From a small organization of Marxist revolutionaries, in 80 years the party grew into a powerful united party numbering today more than 18 million members. Under developed socialist conditions, as the party of the whole people, the CPSU does not lose its class nature and remains the party of the working class. The role which the communist party plays in Soviet society is becoming increasingly important.

The party ensures the strict observance of the principle of democratic centralism and the Leninist norms of party life. It is on their basis that it steadily resolves problems of improving its qualitative structure, party rank unity, enhanced militancy of the primary party organizations, and increasing their influence in labor collectives.

In its work with cadres the party sees to it that all sectors of party, state, economic and cultural-educational activities are headed by politically mature and highly moral, competent and initiative-minded people with organizational talents and a sense for the new. It sees in enhanced principle-mindedness and exigency, the development of criticism and self-criticism and improvements in the system of control and supervision of execution reliable means for detecting and eliminating shortcomings, and strengthening the organization and discipline in all units of the party and state apparatus.

The CPSU ascribes great importance to the all-round assertion of the Leninist work style which is creative and which ensures a scientific approach to all social processes, steady reliance on the masses, high efficiency, concreteness and exigency and intolerance of any display of formalism, bureaucracy and ostentatiousness. The party emphasizes that what is needed today is action rather than loud words.

The inviolable unity between party and people was and remains the source of the invincibility of Soviet society and the further blossoming of the socialist homeland. The ties between the party and the masses become firmer and more fruitful the more consistently and fully the party members perform their vanguard role. At the Second RSDWP Congress V. I. Lenin asked for enhancing the "title and significance of party member higher, higher and higher" (op. cit., vol 7, p 291). The party has remained loyal to this behest to this day. It encourages every party member to become a dedicated fighter for the triumph of its great ideals, and to be profoundly familiar with, and understand and promote in life the ideas of Marxism-Leninism and party policy. Party membership offers no privileges. It merely means that the communists bear greater responsibility for everything taking place in the country, the future of the building of socialism and social progress.

The strength of the communist party rests on the fact that it checks its activities of each and every one of its steps against the immortal doctrine of Marx, Engels and Lenin, which is the only source of accurate answers to the most complex problems of social development and an effective means for the study and reorganization of reality. The interpretation of social experience and arising problems and the creative development of Marxism-Leninism, while mandatorily remaining loyal to its fundamental principles, are considered by the party an important and permanently relevant task.

Ever since its creation the CPSU has been invariably guided by the principles of proletarian and socialist internationalism. Its entire history is an outstanding example of the inseparable combination of the national with the international. Today the CPSU is systematically resolving the double international problem of successfully building the new society in its own country, thus actively influencing the course of the global liberation movement, and giving aid and support to the progressive movements of our time.

The world socialist system has become a decisive factor of social progress. The socialist comity is a new type of international relations based on the principles of socialist internationalism -- ideological unity, common objectives and comradely mutual aid -- while fully respecting the interests, features and traditions of each one of its members. CEMA activities and the implementation of the comprehensive programs for socialist economic integration strengthen the power and social progress of the socialist countries. The Warsaw Pact is a reliable shield of the socialist comity. The problems of strengthening friendship and cooperation with the fraternal countries have always had and will have special priority in the international policies of the CPSU and the Soviet state.

Under the leadership of the communist and worker parties, the peoples of the socialist countries achieved great successes in building socialism. However, the progress of the new system is a complex process which takes place under difficult international circumstances. Imperialism is exerting steady pressure on the socialist countries. It is intensifying its subversive actions against them and organizing concentrated campaigns of lies and slander. Under such circumstances political errors, even the slightest weakening of the party's leading role, and blunders in ideological work may be used by the class enemy to weaken the positions of socialism. Loyalty to the principles of Marxism-Leninism, proper consideration of the overall laws governing the building of the new society and the characteristics of a given country, and close ties between the Marxist-Leninist parties and the masses are mandatory prerequisites for the successful building of socialism.

The decisive struggle which the CPSU and the Soviet state have waged for the abolition of colonialism and the aid and assistance they gave to the national liberation movement contributed to the collapse of the colonial system. Our party actively supports the struggle of the liberated peoples for their political and economic independence, paying particular attention to the development of various relations with socialist-oriented countries. The CPSU highly values the nonaligned movement and its anti-imperialist trend and struggle against colonialism, aggression and the threat of war and for the establishment of fair international economic relations.

The international working class is the main driving force in the revolutionary struggle and the entire democratic and anti-imperialist movement. Our party supports the courageous struggle waged by the working class in the nonsocialist countries for its vital interests, against monopoly omnipotence and for democracy and social progress. The CPSU pursues a consistent line of strengthening the positions of the international communist movement and its unity based on Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism, for the sake of strengthening peace and social progress.

The party firmly rebuffs its ideological opponents and their attacks on real socialism. Together with the other Marxist-Leninist parties it actively opposes and will continue to oppose revisionism and opportunism which are trying to lower the leading role of the communist parties in the struggle for the interests of the working class and the power of the working people in building socialism, and to undermine their unity. The defense and assertion of Marxist-Leninist theory is the international duty of all communists.

Guided by the Leninist principle of peaceful coexistence among countries with different social systems, the CPSU is persistently and systematically struggling for the preservation and consolidation of peace. The peace program for the 1980s, adopted at the 26th CPSU Congress, shows the real practical way for rescuing mankind from the threat of thermonuclear war and relieving it from the burden of the arms race.

Our party's peaceful foreign policy and the major initiatives formulated by the Soviet Union recently and in the Political Declaration adopted at the Prague Warsaw Pact meeting are gaining the increasing support of the international public. The Soviet people support the mass movement of the fighters for peace and against the arms race, which has become widespread in other countries.

Together with the fraternal parties and the working people in the socialist comity and all progressive forces, the CPSU and the entire Soviet people are firmly opposed to imperialism, the U.S. militaristic circles above all, who are trying to organize an anticomunist "crusade" which threatens the world with thermonuclear war.

While systematically defending the cause of peace and security of the nations, the CPSU and the Soviet state also realize that as long as imperialism has not abandoned its aspiration to disturb the existing balance of forces and to gain military superiority, it is important to provide the Soviet Armed Forces with all that is necessary for the defense of the USSR and its allies and friends. In accordance with Lenin's behests the communist party and the Soviet state invariably display high vigilance and take the necessary measures to strengthen our homeland's defense capability.

The path covered by the Leninist party is a truly heroic one of struggles and victories. Tremendous changes have taken place under its guidance, changes which have not only had a decisive impact on the fate of the country but have radically changed the course of universal history. The Soviet people see in the CPSU their tried vanguard and spokesman for their basic interests. They unreservedly support the party's domestic and foreign policy and are actively struggling for its implementation.

The CPSU Central Committee Decrees:

That the 80th anniversary of the Second RSDWP Congress be widely noted as a significant date in the history of our party and Soviet people. In this connection, the central committees of communist parties of union republics, the party kraykoms, obkoms, okruzhkoms, gorkoms and raykoms, the primary party organizations, the soviet organs, the trade union, Komsomol and other social organizations and the political organs of the armed forces shall engage in active political and organizational work. Such work shall take place under the sign of the unbreakable unity between party and people, the further unification of the working people rallied around the CPSU and the mobilization of the masses for the successful implementation of the decisions of the 26th Party Congress and the subsequent CPSU Central Committee plenums, the tasks formulated by Yu. V. Andropov, CPSU Central Committee general secretary, in his November 1982 Central Committee Plenum speech, the report "Sixty Years of

USSR," the article "The Theory of Karl Marx and Some Problems of the Building of Socialism in the USSR," and other speeches and documents.

In ideological and mass political work the efforts must be focused on the dissemination of the ideas of scientific socialism, the Marxist-Leninist doctrine on the party and the universal-historical experience of the CPSU. Such work must be carried out in close connection with the measures related to the celebration of the 165th anniversary of the birth and the centennial of the death of K. Marx. The historical accomplishments of the Soviet people, achieved under the leadership of the communist party, the comprehensive activities of the CPSU and its growing importance in the life of our society must be depicted vividly and convincingly. The great traditions of the struggle for socialism must be used extensively in educational work among the working people, the youth in particular. Party and Komsomol members must become well familiar with the party's history and implement its decisions and policies firmly and undeviatingly.

A ceremonious meeting on the occasion of the 80th anniversary of the Second Party Congress shall be held in Moscow.

The CPSU Central committee expresses its confidence that the party members and all working people in the Soviet Union will welcome properly this great anniversary in the party's history and will mark it with new labor accomplishments for the good of our great socialist homeland and for the sake of the triumph of the cause of peace and social progress.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1983

5003
CSO: 1802/12

V. I. LENIN AND THE FOREIGN POLICY OF THE SOVIET STATE

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 6, Apr 83 pp 11-32

[Article by A. Gromyko, member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, USSR minister of foreign affairs]

[Text] New generations of our 20th century arise to take the place of old ones, but the gigantic figure of V. I. Lenin, who illuminated mankind with the light of his ideas, becomes ever more majestic. The enormous energy and scope of his activity--theoretical and practical, within the framework of the world revolutionary movement and the domestic and foreign policy of the Soviet state--exceed the limits of conventional ideas.

It is impossible to overestimate the achievements of Lenin--a thinker of genius and a true follower of K. Marx and F. Engels--in the creative development of all the component parts of Marxism, which he raised to a new, higher level, and in his consistent implementation of this teaching under new historic conditions. Leninism is Marxism of the era of imperialism and proletarian revolutions and the downfall of the colonial system, the era of mankind's transition from capitalism to socialism. Yu. V. Andropov, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, points out: "Outside and without Leninism, Marxism would simply be impossible nowadays."

Lenin, the leader of the Russian and international proletariat and the party of communists-bolsheviks, which he had created, headed the victorious Great October Socialist Revolution which radically changed the sociopolitical aspect of the world. The Soviet country, which was founded by Lenin, became the first state of the workers and peasants in the history of mankind.

Thereby, scientific socialism merged with the living practices of millions upon millions of the working people. Thus, the foundation was laid for the era of grandiose achievements of the workers class and accomplishments by the masses. It is precisely this alloy of theory and practice which has always been characteristic of Lenin.

The Leninist thought and cause are an inexhaustible source of inspiration for Soviet communists, fraternal communist parties, the international workers movement, the forces of national liberation, and all the people of good will in their struggle for freedom, social progress, and the peaceful future of people.

There has been no other personality in history which has enjoyed such unlimited respect and love of the working masses in our country and abroad. Even those who do not share his ideas pay homage to Lenin's genius. Our class enemies as well cannot but take Leninist ideas into consideration.

The theoretical heritage left by Lenin is inexhaustible in the true sense of the word. It is contained in his works, speeches and reports, conversations, letters, theses and other numerous documents whose every word and phrase are a powerful and sharp weapon of our party, the Soviet people, and all the forces coming out in favor of socialism, democracy and peace.

Defending and enriching the Marxist doctrine, Lenin carried out titanic work in philosophy. With his characteristic depth and crushing logic he demonstrated the vitality of Marxist theory, which reflects the objective laws of social development, and he confirmed the conclusion of its inevitable triumph and, consequently, of the inevitable victory of the workers class and the working people.

In his fundamental work "Materialism and Empirical Criticism" Lenin substantiated and further developed the principles of dialectical and historical materialism and comprehensively analyzed the main philosophical question--that of the relations of awareness to existence, thought to matter, and the basic principles and the most important categories of the Marxist philosophical science, particularly the cognition theory. He also convincingly proved the great significance of the materialist-dialectical method, which he described as the "soul of Marxism," in scientific progress. He resolutely rebuffed the crusade "against the philosophy of Marxism" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 18, p 9), unmasked various theoretical concepts of an openly bourgeois nature, and exposed the unfoundedness and reactionary nature of all sorts of revisionist trends, which demagnetized the will to struggle for the proletarian and socialist revolution. Like no one before him, Lenin poignantly raised the question about the principle of party-mindedness in philosophy, demanding Marxists be intolerant of any variety of idealism and metaphysics.

This work by Lenin was created in difficult times following the defeat of the first Russian revolution of 1905-1907 when defeatist feelings and ideopolitical vacillations sprang up among some party members and generated among others confused and antiscientific philosophical theories. Lenin's book rebuffed these views--views which had nothing in common with the Marxist world outlook--by acting from principled positions and in a well-argumented fashion, and he ideologically armed the Bolshevik Party on the eve of the approaching revolutionary battles. Nowadays it again continues to be an active weapon in the communist struggle against bourgeois philosophy and revisionism.

Lenin elaborated a scientific theory of imperialism which he investigated in many of his works and, first and foremost, in his outstanding book "Imperialism as the Highest Stage of Capitalism." In this work he carried further the analyses of capitalist production given in K. Marx's "Das Kapital" and un-

covered the laws of economic and political development under the conditions of imperialism--the highest and last stage of capitalism and the "eve of the social revolution of the proletariat."

The Leninist theory of imperialism is a remarkable scientific discovery which makes it possible to understand the laws of the contemporary stage of world development and international relations. It has been adopted by both Soviet foreign policy and the world communist movement. Lenin's definitions, marked by depth and accuracy, of the main detachments of imperialism--American, German, English, French and so forth--even nowadays help us elaborate our differentiated policy in regard to capitalist countries such as the United States, the FRG, England, France, Italy, Japan and others.

More than once attempts have been made to limit the significance of Lenin's doctrine and the practical experience of the CPSU to the confines of our country and to make it look as if Leninism is a purely Russian phenomenon. However, the entire course of historical development again and again confirms its international and worldwide significance.

One example is Lenin's concept of the union of the workers class and the peasantry with the proletariat playing the leading role.

In his fundamental work "The Development of Capitalism in Russia," and in other papers, Lenin theoretically substantiated on the basis of vast factual material the commonality of the basic interests of the workers class and the peasantry. This concept played an invaluable role in the party's mobilization of the revolutionary forces in our country both before and after the revolution and in enriching Marxist theory.

Lenin's conclusion about the necessity of the union between the workers class and the peasantry and its implementation in the Soviet country are of great value not only for our domestic policy; they are also exceptionally important for the fraternal parties of the other socialist countries and for those states which are embarking upon the path of profound social transformations even if they have not yet started socialist construction in the full sense of the word.

The dictatorship of the proletariat is the basis and greatest principle of the union between the workers class and the peasantry. Establishing the dictatorship of the proletariat, whose concept Lenin regarded as one of the most important in the Marxist doctrine of the state, is the main content of the socialist revolution and a necessary condition of its victory.

In "Das Kapital" Marx wrote that "this is undoubtedly the most terrible shot ever fired at the head of the bourgeoisie" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch." [Works], vol 31, p 453). How well and accurately this is said!

Just as destructive a shot against the bourgeoisie is contained in Lenin's works about the dictatorship of the proletariat. His classical work "The State and the Revolution," written on the very eve of the Great October, substantiates the conclusion that the primary task of the workers class in the

revolution in regard to the state is the destruction of the bourgeois state apparatus and the establishment of the proletarian dictatorship. Lenin envisages the main paths of developing the socialist statehood, namely through expanding democracy and involving the broadest masses in state management. The book contains crushing criticism of anarchism and opportunism, which distort the Marxist doctrine of the state, and made it vapid of its revolutionary content mainly through denying the dictatorship of the proletariat. Today as well, just as over 6 decades ago, the following words by Lenin continue to be topical: "Only he is a Marxist who expands the acceptance of class struggle to encompass the dictatorship of the proletariat.... The real understanding and acceptance of Marxism must be tested against this touchstone" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 33, p 34).

The Bolshevik Party erected the edifice of the Soviet socialist state on the firm theoretical foundations laid down by Lenin who had summarized the experience of the class struggles before the October Revolution and in its course, as well as the experience of the first years of proletarian dictatorship in our country. On the basis of this foundation the CPSU is perfecting and consolidating the Soviet state and socialist democracy.

The practice of the USSR and other fraternal socialist countries confirms that in the course of building the new society the content of socialist democracy is enriched and the forms of implementing the sovereignty of the people [narodovlastiye] become more varied. The socialist statehood also undergoes qualitative changes, the most important of these being the transformation of the state of proletarian dictatorship into the all-people state. Yu. V. Andropov points out: "This is a change of enormous importance for the political system of socialism. It was reflected in the USSR Constitution, which was unanimously adopted in 1977 and which creates the legislative basis for further deepening socialist democracy."

Our country is at the stage of perfecting developed socialism. The 26th CPSU Congress ascribed the greatest importance in all that has been done in recent years in the sphere of Marxist-Leninist theory to elaborating the concept of developed socialism in which the main features of contemporary Soviet society are reflected. Proceeding from this concept our party determines its strategy and tactics for the very near and more distant future.

It would be possible to continue listing the works of Lenin which have played an enormous role in developing Marxist theory and which have illuminated the path not only for socialist construction in our country but also for our foreign policy.

The change of the social system in a big country such as Russia as a result of the October Revolution gave a powerful jolt to the entire world order established by imperialism. However, even the most far-sighted bourgeois figures of the time did not imagine the full depth of this shock and failed to understand that the October victory signified the decline of the system of international relations based on oppression of the weak states by the strong ones and on exploitation and plunder of the enslaved peoples. Lenin, who

created the doctrine of the foreign policy of socialism, many of whose principles were elaborated even in the prerevolutionary period, clearly understood and foresaw this course of events.

With the birth of the Soviet country the necessity to secure favorable external conditions to consolidate revolutionary gains and establish normal and friendly relations with other states and peoples became an urgent task. Lenin emphasized: "...From the very start of the October Revolution the question of foreign policy and international relations rose before us as the main question...." (op. cit., vol 37, p 153).

The enormous work of defining and scientifically substantiating the main aims and the chief principles and direction of the internationalist activity of the communist party and the Soviet state was carried out by Lenin. Heading this activity for several years, he was the first to unite the theory of scientific communism with the foreign-political practice of the socialist state. It is from this fruitful merger that an unprecedented foreign policy was born, which became a reliable support for the peoples in their further struggle for peace, freedom, independence and socialism.

It is impossible to speak without admiration about Lenin's contribution, which laid the foundation in establishing the foreign policy of the Soviet country and its diplomatic service. Here we find both the elaboration of the strategy and tactics of this policy and the scientific foresight of the course of the revolutionary and liberation struggle, the utilization of interimperialist contradictions, and the skillful use of the entire arsenal of forms, ways and methods of socialist diplomacy. Lenin's foreign political activity was and continues to be a most vivid example--preserving all its significance--of party-mindedness and extreme adherence to principle, and of his skill in evaluating the social, economic, and political processes and phenomena in their inseparable and contradictory interconnection, giving timely response to the changes in the international situation.

Lenin pointed out: "Politics is a science and an art which does not fall down from the sky and cannot be obtained without effort, and...the proletariat, if it wants to defeat the bourgeoisie, must educate its own proletarian 'class politicians' and these should be as good as the bourgeois politicians" (op. cit., vol 41, p 65). In this connection it is appropriate to note Lenin's outstanding role in educating a whole generation of new type diplomats--Soviet diplomats who defended not the exploited classes but the interests of the working people and the advanced socialist system in the international arena. These diplomats learned from Lenin to master the methods of diplomatic art, namely to take the initiative and advance, but also be capable of defending themselves and maneuvering when the interests of the Soviet state require this. Even now the CPSU follows Lenin's approach to the Soviet diplomatic service while proceeding from the fact that the practical implementation of the foreign policy course of the USSR is a complex and responsible affair, and in order to accomplish this the diplomats must have a high level of theoretical training and professional qualifications.

Lenin personally engaged in all the questions of Soviet foreign policy and diplomatic service both major and minor. He even devoted his time to minor affairs such as instruction on organizing a diplomatic courier service or the schedule of work of the People's Commissariat for Foreign Affairs. G. V. Chicherin, people's commissar for foreign affairs, who had worked under Lenin's immediate guidance, later wrote that he had often discussed the details of all current diplomatic affairs which were of any importance with Vladimir Il'ich. In his words, "Immediately grasping the essence of every question and immediately interpreting the question within a very broad political framework, Vladimir Il'ich in his conversation always delivered the most brilliant analysis of the diplomatic situation, and his advice (he often offered advice) and the very text of his answer to another government could be used as an example of diplomatic art and flexibility" (G. V. Chicherin: "Stat'i i Rechi po Voprosam Mezhdunarodnoy Politiki" [Articles and Speeches on the Questions of International Politics], Moscow, 1961, p 277).

Lenin wrote hundreds of documents on foreign policy questions--from the first foreign political act of the Soviet state, the "Decree on Peace," to his directives to the international conferences in which the Soviet delegations took part, and notes and instructions to the ambassadors. These documents are distinguished by the depth of thought and a laconic and always extremely accurate and expressive form.

Lenin often had to take into his own hands the diplomatic aspect of the state activity. He sent messages to the heads of states and governments, led negotiations which he conducted, and met and talked to a large number of foreign representatives, public figures, journalists and writers.

Lenin taught us to adopt a realistic and sober approach to the multifaceted reality of international relations. G. V. Chicherin recalled: "His inimitable political realism often saved us from mistakes of which other more impressionable comrades were capable" (*ibid.*).

The skill of foreseeing the development of events in interstate relations many moves in advance forms the foundation of Lenin's tactical flexibility which so much amazed his contemporaries. The line of action which he envisaged often took by surprise those who continued to think in yesterday's categories and failed to see the change in the situation. These qualities of Lenin were manifested most vividly at the important moments of history such as the Brest peace treaty, the Genoa conference, and the Rapallo treaty with Germany.

Lenin ascribed particular significance to the necessity of a strictly scientific approach to the phenomena of international life and foreign policy which is incompatible with voluntarism, bending to circumstances, superficial improvisation, and scholastic theorizing. He wrote: "Marxism demands of us the very accurate and objectively verifiable account of the correlation of classes and concrete specific features of every historical moment. As Bolsheviks we have always striven to remain true to this demand which is unconditionally obligatory from the point of view of any scientific substantiation of politics" (*op. cit.*, vol 31, p 132).

Emphasizing his idea that politics must be based on a solid scientific foundation, Lenin pointed out: "...He who tackles individual questions without previously solving general ones will inevitably and without becoming aware of this 'stumble over' these general questions in his every step. Stumbling over them blindly in every individual case means condemning one's policy to even worse vacillations and lack of principle" (op. cit., vol 15, p 368).

In its entire activity in the international arena the CPSU and the Soviet state have been invariably true to Lenin's behest to discover correctly the leading tendency of social development by way of scientifically defining the nature of the contemporary stage. Lenin noted: "We cannot know how fast and how successfully certain historical movements of a given stage may develop. However, we can and we do know which class is at the centerpoint of this or that stage, thus determining its main content, the main direction of its development, the main specific features of the historical situation at the given stage, and so forth. Only on this basis, that is by taking into account first of all the main distinguishing features of different 'epochs' (and not of individual episodes in the history of individual countries), can we correctly arrange our tactics. Only the knowledge of the main features of the given stage may serve as a basis for taking into account in greater detail the specific features of this or that country" (op. cit., vol 26, p 142).

A basic aspect of Lenin's approach to international affairs is his analysis of the problems of foreign and domestic policy in their organic unity, unconditioned on the fact that both these kinds of policy are dialectically interconnected and have common roots, because the main content of both the foreign and the domestic policy of the states, is determined by their socioeconomic system. Lenin resolutely rejected those bourgeois concepts which "proved" the independence of domestic and foreign policies, and their independence of each other, and affirmed the primacy of foreign policy. Lenin pointed out: "To single out 'foreign policy' from policy in general, let alone to oppose foreign policy to domestic is an utterly false, non-Marxist, and unscientific idea" (op. cit., vol 30, p 93).

It is precisely the inseparable interconnection between the foreign and domestic policies of a socialist state, resulting from its social system, which explains the fact that socialism alone guarantees the genuinely democratic principles of international communion, full respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of all countries, and equality in interstate cooperation, and that it selflessly supports all the peoples fighting for their national liberation and social progress.

While evaluating the events of international life and solving the practical tasks of the foreign-political activity of the Soviet state, Lenin regarded the strict application of class criterion to be of paramount importance. This requirement is itself a precept for every communist, particularly if the party and state have entrusted him with carrying out and defending our course in foreign policy, a precept to which he must strictly adhere by mobilizing his intellect, energy, experience and knowledge.

Viewing the foreign policy of the states as an expression of the interests of their respective ruling classes, and the essence of world politics as the class struggle between the opposing socioeconomic systems, Lenin always skillfully unmasked the class core of every international issue, however deeply it might be hidden. He wrote: "When it is not immediately obvious which political and social groups, forces, and figures defend certain proposals, measures, and so forth, a question should always be raised: 'Who benefits from this?'... In politics it is less important who directly defends certain views. It is important who benefits from these views, proposals and measures" (op. cit., vol 23, p 61).

Lenin emphasized that the "state of affairs regarding the socialist revolution in Russia must be used as a foundation for every definition of the international tasks of our Soviet regime" (op. cit., vol 35, p 244), and that it is necessary to subordinate everything to the interests of defending and consolidating the socialist gains in our country.

His actions followed his words. The following incident can serve as an example. In February 1918 Lenin happened to talk to a certain De Lubersac, a French officer and advocate of Germany's defeat. Lenin recalled that the monarchist views of his interlocutor did not prevent him from "agreeing" on "services, which the French officers--demolition specialists--were eager to offer to us for blowing up railways in the interest of preventing the German advance." Lenin called this a "model...agreement in the interests of socialism" and pointed out: "We shook each other's hands, the French monarchist and myself.... For the time being our interests coincided. Against the advancing German predators we utilized in the interests of the Russian and international socialist revolution the equally predatory counterinterests of other imperialists" (op. cit., vol 37, pp 55-56).

Lenin waged an uncompromising battle against the so-called "leftists" in our party who considered it possible to sacrifice the already existing revolutionary base, personified in the Soviet regime, for the sake of allegedly pushing ahead the world revolution. At the same time he unmasked the rightist capitulators who did not believe in the victory of the socialist transformation in our country surrounded by a hostile capitalist world.

Our country proceeded and continues to proceed from the assumption that the inclination to remain passive in the face of imperialist threats, and the passion for ultrarevolutionary phraseology, are in fact like twin brothers. They come from the same source, namely from underestimating the strength and the entire variety of possibilities available to the workers class and the socialist states in implementing their historic mission in the world arena.

Thus, defending the basic interests of the Soviet people and securing with the other socialist countries favorable international conditions for the socialist and communist construction--this is the instruction we can draw for the present stage from Lenin's behests.

The position of our country in the world and the international situation have dramatically changed in comparison with the period when Lenin was at the head

of the Soviet state. Our country has grown immeasurably in economic, defense, scientific-technical, and cultural respects. As a result of the historic victory scored by the Soviet people in the Great Fatherland War, the USSR was unconditionally accorded the status of a great power in world affairs, a power without which no problem of any significance could be solved. The Yalta and Potsdam agreements in particular testify to this. This is reflected in the UN Charter, in accordance with which the Soviet Union, as one of the permanent members of the Security Council, carries particular responsibility for maintaining international peace and security.

Accordingly, just as in the cause of communist construction as a whole, our country faces more and more new tasks in the sphere of international policy. However, even nowadays the CPSU has an accurate and reliable reference point in a sphere as complex as the relations between states and peoples where various factors--economic, political, military, national, and even psychological--interact, interweave and clash, where the resultant force of the various components is far from being easily defined. This reference point is the Leninist doctrine of the foreign policy of the socialist state and the Leninist practice of its implementation.

Soviet foreign policy, which has grown out of the socialist revolution, served and continues to serve the revolutionary transformation in our country. This foreign policy is internationalist in nature, because the interests of the Soviet people coincide with the interests of the working people in all the countries of the world. This policy is imbued with the spirit of solidarity with all the revolutionary and progressive forces of the present.

Soviet foreign policy is distinguished by its profound and genuine democracy, by its actual acceptance of the equality of all states, and by its acceptance of the equality of all races and nationalities. The foreign policy of the Soviet Union is imbued with genuine humanitarianism because it is a consistent policy of peace. Socialism knows no other goals than to show concern for the interests of the people, which presupposes first of all a tireless struggle for preventing war.

The class-conscious socialist nature and content of the foreign policy of the USSR are reflected in its basic principles--in proletarian internationalism and in the peaceful coexistence of states of different social systems, principles which were put forward by Lenin.

Revealing the essence of proletarian internationalism Lenin wrote that "Capital is an international force. An international union of workers, their international brotherhood is necessary to defeat it. We are against nationalistic hostility, nationalistic discord, and nationalistic isolation. We are internationalists" (op. cit., vol 40, p 43).

Having appeared at the dawn of the international communist movement, proletarian internationalism is one of the main principles of the ideology and policy of the workers class and its party. It expresses the solidarity of the working people of different countries in their struggle against capitalism, for their social and national liberation, for building socialism and communism, and for the peaceful life of the peoples.

With the victory of the October Revolution proletarian internationalism became the cornerstone of the foreign policy of the Soviet state and is expressed in the consistent support of the revolutionary and liberation movement of the working masses and oppressed peoples. The ideas of proletarian internationalism were implemented for the first time in history in the process of building socialism in the USSR, where the national question has been solved, a multinational state of equal peoples has been formed, and where relations between the nationalities, which are free of class and national antagonisms, have taken shape.

The principle of proletarian internationalism has acquired a qualitatively new expression with the formation of the world socialist system--the most significant historical event after the victory of the Great October--whose emergence went hand in hand with the departure of individual countries or groups of countries from the capitalist system, and was brilliantly foreseen by Lenin. Lenin also predicted the main features of future relations between the socialist countries. The 13 November 1918 resolution of the All-Union Central Executive Committee, signed by Lenin, about annulling the Brest-Litovsk peace treaty, said that "only those principles which correspond to the fraternal relations between the working people of all countries and nations" can form the basis of such relations and "the relations between the peoples based on these foundations...will be more than just peaceful relations. This will be a union of the working masses of all nations in their struggle to create and consolidate the socialist system on the ruins of the system of militarism, imperialism, and economic slavery" ("Dokumenty Vneshney Politiki SSSR" [Documents of USSR Foreign Policy], vol I, Moscow, 1957, p 566).

When applied to relations between the socialist states, proletarian internationalism manifests itself in its highest form, namely, as socialist internationalism, which includes not only the unity of action of the national detachments of the victorious workers class and their Marxist-Leninist vanguard, but also the comprehensive solidarity and interaction between the fraternal countries. Socialist internationalism is a law-governed stage in the development of the international solidarity of the workers class under those historical conditions when it became the ruling class and its Marxist-Leninist parties became the ruling parties, and when they faced in practice the tasks of building socialism and communism, developing and consolidating international relations of a socialist type, strengthening the international positions of the world socialist system, and jointly defending the socialist gains.

Striving to implement these tasks means to accomplish the maximum possible in one's own country for the growing power and cohesion of all socialist states, and showing concern in every possible way about implementing the principle of socialist internationalism in their relations. The national interests of every socialist country and the international, common and basic interests of the socialist community must organically combine in their policies. It is also clear that the very fact that a socialist system has been established in a number of countries does not automatically lead to solving all the questions of shaping new relations between them. All this requires, first of all, is an active, aware, and purposeful work on the part of the communist

parties in power. This is precisely the way in which the CPSU and other fraternal parties have acted and continued to act.

At present the community of socialist states is an association of countries characterized by the interaction of their ruling communist parties, state organs and public organizations based on the principles of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism, as well as by their intensively developing economic integration and unprecedented scope of cooperation in all spheres of life, including the effective coordination of their activity in the international arena. The mutual relations between these countries, which are international relations of a new type, are characterized--alongside with genuine equality, noninterference in each others' internal affairs, and mutual respect for independence, sovereignty, and territory integrity--by fraternal friendship and comradely mutual help. On the whole, this makes up the core of socialist internationalism.

The close cooperation between the states of the socialist community knitted together by their uniform political and socioeconomic system, the unity of their world outlook, and the commonality of their aims and ideals in the struggle for peace and socialism, has now developed into a fraternal union personified by the Warsaw Pact organization and the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance as well as by the system of bilateral treaties of friendship, cooperation, and mutual assistance which bind these countries together. This union is also reflected in the process of the comprehensive approximation of the socialist states, which becomes ever deeper and manifests itself as an objective law, and which leads--on the basis of harmoniously combining the national and international interests--to their further cohesion, to the ever-closer intertwining of their economies and mutual intellectual enrichment, uniting their efforts, knowledge, and resources for jointly solving the key questions of socialist and communist construction, and strengthening the positions of socialism in the world.

In their development the countries of the socialist community meet certain difficulties which are sometimes quite serious. Of course this development follows as yet unpaved ways, continues through the struggle of that which is old against that which is new, solving internal contradictions and overcoming illusions and mistakes. Lenin wrote that the proletariat "will not become a saint and be insured against all mistakes and weaknesses simply because it has accomplished a social revolution" (op. cit., vol 30, p 51).

Besides, the international situation does not always favor the development of the socialist community. The socialist countries act under the conditions of a sharp clash between the two systems and are subject to hard pressure by imperialism.

Life confirms that the socialist community is capable of successfully overcoming all that prevents its onward movement. Let nobody doubt the common resolution of the fraternal states to defend their interests, secure the stability of all the component elements making up the community, and protect the socialist gains.

Yu. V. Andropov notes: "...Evaluating the present stage in the development of our countries we can state with satisfaction that ... the community of the socialist countries is a powerful and healthy organism which plays a great and beneficial role in the modern world."

This role manifests itself very fully and strongly in the Leninist foreign policy of the Soviet Union, whose platform is the Program for Peace elaborated by the 24th, 25th and 26th CPSU Congresses, and in the international activity of all fraternal countries. At present it is possible to speak of a united foreign-political strategy of the socialist community, which serves as a powerful instrument to positively influence the course of world events and resolutely and consistently comes out in favor of peace and international cooperation as well as freedom and independence of the peoples. The significance of this course pursued by the socialist states is particularly great in the present international situation, which has been seriously complicated as a result of the aggressive intrigues of the imperialist circles, first and foremost the United States.

The effectiveness of the foreign policy of socialism and its ability to bring results to a great extent depend on the coordinated and cohesive effort and steps of the socialist countries in international affairs. The coordination of these efforts and steps is based on a firm foundation of treaties. It is envisaged both by the Warsaw Treaty and by bilateral treaties of friendship, cooperation, and mutual assistance.

The states of the socialist community have accumulated great positive experience in cooperating in the foreign-political sphere. The forms of such cooperation include consulting on main international problems, mutually exchanging information on a constantly growing scale, elaborating and implementing common coordinated policy, and interacting in the closest possible manner, while carrying out practical measures in the international arena.

The mechanism of coordinating the foreign political activity of the socialist countries has been established and is successfully functioning. Exchanging opinions on topical international questions and elaborating their joint foreign policy course is a constant subject of negotiations between the leaders of fraternal parties and countries in the course of their regular bilateral and multilateral meetings, including those which take place within the framework of the Political Consultative Committee very important proposals on the cardinal questions of European and international politics were elaborated and many of these formed the basis of discussions conducted in the United Nations and at other international gatherings, or were reflected in a number of major treaties and accords concluding with the participation of countries of different social systems. The Political Declaration adopted at the meeting of the Political Consultative Committee, which took place in Prague in January this year, contains new large-scale initiatives. The Committee of Foreign Ministers of the Warsaw Pact member countries also makes its contribution into coordinating the foreign-political steps taken by socialist countries.

The coordinated actions of socialist countries in the international arena have made it possible to successfully resolve many large and complicated

tasks, for which they had been fighting for a long time. These actions decisively helped undermine the imperialist blockade of Cuba. They also helped secure the international legal recognition of the GDR; the conclusion of treaties between the USSR, the GDR, the Polish People's Republic and the CSSR with the FRG, as well as the conclusion of the Quadripartite Agreement on West Berlin; the successful course of the all-European conference; the glorious victory of the Vietnamese peoples over American aggressors; and the achievement of a number of agreements oriented at limiting the arms race.

Lenin foresaw that, after changing from a national force into an international one, socialism would be capable of exerting a "decisive influence on the entire world politics" (op. cit., vol 41, p 165). His vision is coming true. Currently the community of the states of socialism is the main barrier on the path of imperialism's adventurist policy; it is the powerful bulwark of all forces fighting for their national and social liberation, a powerful factor of contemporary world development.

In the deep realization of their historical responsibility for the fate of the world and of socialism, the states of the socialist community are unwaveringly striving to further close their ranks. The cause of friendship and cooperation with the fraternal parties always held, and will continue to hold, a special, priority place in the international policy of the CPSU and the Soviet state.

Leninist doctrine is a reliable guideline in the policy pursued by the CPSU and the Soviet state toward countries which had rid themselves of colonial oppression, and toward the national liberation movement of the peoples.

On the basis of an analysis of social development in the era of imperialism and of socialist revolutions, Lenin formulated the conclusion that the "socialist revolution will not be merely, and mainly, a fight of the revolutionary proletarians in every country against the entire bourgeoisie," but that it "will be the fight of all colonies and countries oppressed by imperialism, the fight of all dependent countries against international imperialism" (op. cit., vol 39, p 327). He showed that countries, and peoples living in colonial or semicolonial dependence, inevitably change from being a reserve, a backwater of imperialism, into an active anti-imperialist force, an ally of the socialist revolution. Attributing extraordinary significance to the close international union between the revolution in Russia and the liberation movement of the peoples in colonial and dependent states, Lenin noted even prior to the victory of October: "We will exert every effort to draw nearer to, and merge with, the Mongolians, Persians, Indians, and Egyptians; we consider it our duty, and also in our interests, to do this, since otherwise socialism will be unstable in Europe" (op. cit., vol 30, p 120).

The political significance of Lenin's conclusion about the closest connection between the social liberation of the workers class in metropolises and the battle for the independence of their colonial domains is quite obvious--this is a matter of the historic fate of the majority of the globe's population, of the distribution of forces on a worldwide scale. Lenin defined the basic laws governing the development of the peoples' liberation movement. He

prophesied the inevitable downfall of the colonial system, substantiated the idea of a noncapitalist path of development, and worked out the issue of building the new society in economically undeveloped countries.

Lenin believed that, in developing cooperation with the countries that are striving to rid themselves of the fetters of colonialism and to consolidate independence and national and social progress, the socialist states should proceed from the objective community of their key interests, and also from the vital interests of these countries, in the fight against imperialism. From this it follows that it is necessary for them to proceed in such cooperation not only from the principle of peaceful coexistence, which regulates relations between states with different social systems, but also from the principle of internationalism, which defines relations between socialist countries and the forces that are class-related to them, as well as all anti-imperialist forces. Such an approach takes into account the realistic situation of states that are the object of imperialist exploitation even when their policy is being determined by governments which represent bourgeois, and sometimes even feudal, circles.

On this basis Lenin sketched the specific tasks of socialism's policy and diplomacy with regard to the countries in question: to support the efforts aimed at consolidating national independence and to assist all progressive undertakings; to help them overcome their economic and cultural backwardness; to adhere to strict equal rights and noninterference in internal affairs; to express understanding and respect for national and historic traditions; to assist their participation, on the basis of equal rights, in resolving international issues; and to be in solidarity with their fight against the forces of imperialism. This new socialist course laid the foundation of the international anti-imperialist front.

The Great October Socialist Revolution united into a single stream the proletariat's fight for socialism and the peoples' movement against colonial oppression, and called forth an unprecedented upsurge of this movement which has achieved grandiose success since that time.

The principles of the peoples' equality and sovereignty, the renunciation of all national and national-religious privileges and limitations, and the free development of national minorities and ethnic groups proclaimed in the very first foreign-political acts of the country of the soviets, helped resolve the nationality issue in the USSR on just socialist principles. The advancement and realization of these principles undermined the past national animosity and won for the Russian workers class the confidence of peoples in outlying areas inhabited by nationalities. After shaking off the exploiters' oppression, they united with the Russian peoples in a multinational socialist state.

The Leninist appeal "To All Working Moslems of Russia and of the East," adopted on 20 November (3 December) 1917, was of paramount significance in establishing friendly relations with the countries of the East. In the part addressing the working masses of areas beyond the eastern borders, the appeal stated: "It is not from Russia and its revolutionary government that you can

expect enslavement, but from the predators of European imperialism,, from those who have turned your fatherland into a plundered and robbed "colony" of theirs.... You yourself must become masters of your country! You yourselves must arrange your life after your likeness! You have the right to do this, since your fate lies in your own hands" ("Dokumenty Vneshney Politiki SSSR," vol 1, page 35).

This appeal proclaimed the destruction of secret treaties aimed against the interests of the Eastern peoples, specifically the treaties on the division of Turkey and Iran. Soon the treaties with China, which were also not based on equal rights, were declared to be null and void.

At the same time the country of the soviets called upon the countries of the East to establish good neighborly relations on the basis of real voluntarism, equal rights, and mutual respect. Throughout the first years of our state's existence, diplomatic relations were established and friendly cooperation set up with countries such as China, Mongolia, Turkey and Afghanistan. Likewise, the selfless support granted them by Soviet Russia established for these countries the possibility of upholding and stabilizing their national independence.

In continuing the work started during Lenin's time, the Soviet state's foreign policy exerted considerable effort to shatter the colonial system and to bring nearer the hour of victory for the liberation struggle of the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America. With the USSR's decisive participation, the utter defeat of the darkest and most aggressive forces of imperialism in World War II and the organization of the world socialist system tore off the fetters hampering the stormy growth of the national liberation movement.

One should also recall that the Soviet Union had insisted on the inclusion of demands about the peoples' equal rights and self-determination in the UN Charter. This created prerequisites for the later actions undertaken by this international organization in support of the liberation struggle. It is very well known what a help the declaration granting independence to colonial countries and peoples, adopted by the United Nations in 1960 on the USSR's initiative, was for all those who were still facing the prospect of skirmishes with the colonizers.

As a result of the crash of the shameful system of colonialism, dozens of peoples acquired freedom and independence. For many of them, the possibility of leaning on the Soviet Union and on other countries of socialism was, and is, of vital significance. Time and again, the USSR's resolute pronouncements in defense of the victims of aggression, and its material support, helped young national states stand their ground when faced by imperialist meddling in their internal affairs.

At the same time it is understandable that a project as large as the process of the national liberation of countries and peoples, and of the consolidation of the developing states' independence, cannot remain without temporary failures and setbacks. But the final outcome of their struggle is undoubted.

The Soviet Union continues to be loyal to this very day to the Leninist traditions of friendship and cooperation with the peoples of the countries of Asia, Africa, and Latin America. Our country is granting them broad political, economic and other support. The series of treaties on friendship and cooperation, concluded by the Soviet Union with India, Syria, Angola, Ethiopia, Mozambique, Afghanistan, the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen and other states indicate the high level of development of the USSR's relations with these countries. These treaties are between independent and peace-loving countries with equal rights.

The Soviet Union stands on the side of those who even today are forced to fight for freedom and independence, for the very existence of their peoples; of those who are forced to ward off the onslaught of the aggressive forces of imperialism or who are under the threat of their aggression. The USSR firmly supports the just struggle of the Arab peoples against the Israeli aggressors who are encouraged by Washington. It grants the necessary assistance to the Afghan peoples who are defending their inalienable right to arrange their lives as they like free from external encroachments. The Soviet peoples are in total sympathy with the peoples of Nicaragua, who are repulsing the ruthless imperialist pressure; with the courageous patriots of El Salvador, who are battling against the rotten antipopular regime which its Washington sponsors are striving to prop up. Our country feels solidarity with the fight of the people of Namibia who will certainly achieve freedom and independence.

The USSR regards with respect the movement of nonaligned states, whose strength lies in its orientation against imperialism and colonialism, against war and aggression. It is this orientation that is the key to further enhancing the role of the nonaligned movement in world politics. In this sense the results of the seventh conference of the heads of states and governments of nonaligned countries, which was held this March in New Delhi, are most positive.

In the future, the CPSU and the Soviet states will also consistently follow, as was underscored by the 26th CPSU Congress, the line of developing cooperation with the liberated countries and of consolidating the union of world socialism with the national liberation movement.

Lenin theoretically prepared our party for the situation which emerged after the victory of the socialist revolution in Russia.

After discovering the law on the uneven development of capitalism at the stage of imperialism, he came to the conclusion that socialism cannot be victorious in all countries simultaneously and that, consequently, the co-existence of states with two opposed social systems--socialist and capitalist --is inevitable.

The rivalry of these systems represents the basic content of the entire historical era in which we are living. At the same time Lenin rejected the idea that this struggle could inevitably lead to permanent wars between capitalist and socialist countries.

The issue of mutual relations of states with opposed systems was formulated by Lenin on a practical level, in works written on the eve of the October Revolution, that is, in "Letters From Far Away," in which he dealt with the measures that would have to be taken after a new government of workers and peasants comes to power. He voiced his opinion on this issue time and again, in talks and interviews with foreign correspondents in the period of the Soviet republic's fight to end the war and to conclude the Brest peace.

Lenin's Decree on Peace proclaimed the peaceful coexistence of countries with different social systems to be one of the fundamental principles of the foreign policy of the socialist state.

One should also turn to the events connected with the Genoa conference held 60 years ago, which was the first international forum open to the Soviet state. Some of the comrades suggested that Lenin, who was appointed representative of our delegation to this conference, make use of its rostrum to deliver sharp accusing speeches. However, Lenin--who directed the entire preparation of the Soviet delegation to the Genoa conference--did not see his task in this way. He defined for it directives which proceeded from the necessity to entertain normal business relations with the capitalist countries. What an acute, brilliant insight was needed to map out, under the conditions of the gigantic social changes taking place in the world, a long-term general line of relations between the country of the soviets and the capitalist world!

In his corrections and annotations to the draft of the delegation's statement, Lenin, proceeding from the principle of peaceful coexistence, proposed to "absolutely discard any reminder of the 'inevitable forcible coup and the application of bloody fighting,' and to 'exclude the words that our historical concept absolutely envisages the inevitability of new world wars.'" He further wrote: "On no account should such terrible words be used, since this would mean playing into the hands of our adversary" (op. cit., vol 45, pp 63-64).

It is known that Lenin did not travel to Genoa, complying with the general decision of the RKP(b) Central Committee in view of the resolute opposition of the working people of our country to a trip that could have endangered his life. G. V. Chicherin, deputy chairman of the Soviet delegation to the Genoa conference, delivered there the speech that was to have been delivered by Lenin. This speech opened with a statement of a programmatic nature: "Adhering to the viewpoint of the principles of communism, the Russian delegation acknowledges that in the current historical epoch which allows for parallel existence of the old and of the just emerging, new social system, the economic cooperation between the states representing these two ownership systems is imperative and necessary for general economic reconstruction" ("Dokumenty Vneshney Politiki SSSR", Vol V, Moscow, 1961, pp 191-192).

In many of his works Lenin returned again and again to the principle of peaceful coexistence, illuminating and explaining it from many aspects.

He sometimes used the term "peaceful cohabitation" of systems, at other times he used other formulations, but the sense remained the same--there exist objective possibilities for peaceful relations between the Soviet state and the capitalist world surrounding it.

During Lenin's time, in June 1920, when Soviet Russia's foreign policy was being discussed at a session of the All-Union Central Executive Committee, G. V. Chicherin declared: "We do not want people to hinder us in developing the way we wish, in building our new socialist society in peace. We do not carry our system or our power on our bayonets, and everyone knows this; despite this, newer enemies are being set upon us. Our policy is one of peace, but it is not a policy of capitulation." He added: "Our slogan is and remains the same: peaceful coexistence with other governments, whatever they are" ("Dokumenty Vneshney Politiki SSSR", Vol II, Moscow, 1958, pp 638-39).

Decades of a stubborn fight against the imperialists' attempts to liquidate the socialist system in this or that way and to stifle the Soviet state were needed before the West learned to articulate words about peaceful coexistence. The dispute between socialism and capitalism on the possibility or impossibility of peaceful coexistence of states regardless of their social system--which started on the fronts of the Civil War and in the battle against foreign intervention and which continued in the combat against Hitlerite Germany and its allies--has been resolved by history. It has been resolved in favor of the recognition of socialism and its foreign policy as sketched by Lenin.

Peaceful coexistence is a specific form of class struggle between socialism and capitalism. This struggle is and will be waged in the sphere of the economy, politics, and undoubtedly ideology as well, since the world outlook and class goals of the two social systems are opposed and irreconcilable. However, this historically inevitable antagonism must be carried out in forms that will not create military conflicts, much less threaten the very existence of mankind.

Under present conditions, a strict adherence to the principle of peaceful coexistence has acquired a particular significance, since the peaceful coexistence of socialist and capitalist states is the only sensible alternative to a nuclear catastrophe.

In advocating a reorganization of international relations on the basis of the principle of peaceful coexistence, socialist foreign policy regards this not as a purpose in itself, but as an important component of resolving the most burning issue of the present--the exclusion of war from the life of human society and the consolidation of a stable, just and democratic peace on earth. In striving for this goal, this policy has nothing in common with concessions to the militarist circles of imperialism; it combines consistent love of peace with a firm rebuff of aggression.

The inculcation of the principle of peaceful coexistence into relations between the socialist and capitalist states is directly and immediately tied to the growing power of socialism as a social system. The enhanced power and cohesion and the active peace-loving policy of world socialism and its

strengthening ties with all progressive and antiwar forces, as well as realization of the unfounded nature of calculations to resolve the historical dispute between capitalism and socialism by force of arms, which has forced its way into the mind of soberly reflecting leaders of the bourgeois world--all this has established prerequisites which helped turn the development of international relations from the "cold war" and confrontation to detente and a mutually advantageous cooperation, a turn which began in the 1970s. The principles of peaceful coexistence became increasingly consolidated as a norm of relations between states with different social systems.

A solution was found at that time to a series of problems which earlier appeared to be insoluble and which had poisoned the international atmosphere for a prolonged period of time. Political contacts, including contacts at higher levels, developed among countries with different socioeconomic systems. Dozens of important treaties and agreements were concluded between them, and connections in the trade-economic, scientific-technical, and cultural spheres as well as in other fields expanded substantially.

The principle of peaceful coexistence which thus entered the actual structure of European and world politics, was also reaffirmed in major bilateral and multilateral agreements. Thus, in the document concerning the foundations of mutual relations between the USSR and the United States signed in 1972, the intentions of the two sides were noted to proceed from the joint conviction that in the nuclear age there is no basis for maintaining relations other than peaceful coexistence. This principle was taken as the basis for the final act of the all-European conference.

"In our deep conviction," Yu. V. Andropov pointed out at the November 1982 CPSU Central Committee Plenum, "the 1970s, which passed in the spirit of detente, were not, as some imperialist figures are maintaining today, an accidental episode in the difficult history of mankind. No, the policy of detente is not at all a bygone stage. The future belongs to this policy. All are equally interested in preserving peace and detente."

Therefore, the Leninist principle of peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems, which is being upheld by the foreign policy of socialism, agrees with the nature, basic law-governed characteristics, and requirements of the modern epoch, and hence possesses a great life-giving strength.

"The pivotal orientation of the foreign policy activity of the party and state," it is pointed out in the accountability report of the CPSU Central Committee to its 26th Congress, "has been and still is the struggle to reduce the threat of war, to contain the arms race."

"Lenin saw clearly that the destiny of the revolution in Russia and of the entire liberation struggle of the peoples depends in many respects on the correct solution of the problems of war and peace. Marxism-Leninism exposed the aggressive nature of capitalism in its highest stage--imperialism--which, being a historically doomed social system, professes the cult of force and is banking on militarism. Lenin underscored that there are two forms of militarism--internal and external--and in both forms it is a 'vital manifestation'

of capitalism: as a military force used by the capitalist states in their external clashes...and as a weapon in the hands of the ruling classes serving the purpose of suppressing any type of (economic and political) movement of the proletariat...." (op. cit., vol 17, p 187).

In contrast, there are no classes or social groups in socialist society which are interested in war. Inherent in this society is the aspiration to peace because the interests of building socialism and communism require peaceful conditions. "Putting an end to wars, realizing peace among nations, discontinuing pilferage and violence," Lenin noted, "this precisely is our ideal" (op. cit., vol 26, p 30).

Moreover, he pointed out even at the height of World War I that only a worker-peasant state "is able to successfully solve the unusually difficult and absolutely urgent, most important task of the moment, namely, to achieve peace,, but not an imperialist peace, not a deal between imperialist powers on dividing the booty amassed through robbery by the capitalists and their governments, but a really solid and democratic peace...." (op. cit., vol 31, p 55).

It was under Lenin's slogan of putting an end to the imperialist war and of establishing peace that the Bolshevik Party led the masses in the revolution. The very day after its completion the Soviet state came out with the Decree on Peace in which imperialist wars were denounced as "the greatest crime against mankind" and in which the proposal to end the world war and to conclude a just, democratic peace was put forward.

Lenin attached particular significance to the role of the masses in the struggle for peace. In the Decree on Peace the Soviet state appealed to the conscientious workers of the advanced nations to help the success of the cause of peace with their comprehensive, resolute and selflessly vigorous activities. Justifying the need for appealing to the broad masses of working people, Lenin stated in the report on peace at the Second Congress of Soviets: "Our appeal must be addressed to both the governments and the peoples.... We must help the peoples to intervene in problems related to war and peace" (op. cit., vol 35, p 16).

Lenin's words that "the socialists have always denounced war between peoples as a barbarous and brutal affair" (op. cit., vol 26, p 311) and that "we know too well what unheard-of misery wars entail for both workers and peasants" (op. cit., vol 44, p 297) remain topical. At the same time Lenin was far from cheap pacifism.

Placing the interests of the working classes, that is, the majority of the inhabitants of the earth, above any other consideration, he introduced the thesis of just wars--wars which are being waged to free the working masses from socialist and national oppression, to protect the people from external aggression, and to protect the socialist state from external attack.

Lenin mercilessly castigated the various imperialist coalitions, "ententes," and other combinations behind which stood the predatory interests of the big

imperialist powers, which were inciting the peoples against each other for the sake of partitioning and repartitioning the world and for the sake of pilferage and exploitation. How many efforts the Soviet Union undertook to prevent a second world war! Availing itself of any opportunity, including the League of Nations in Geneva, Soviet foreign policy strove to paralyze the forces of aggression, and counterpose a collective front of the partisans of peace to the approaching war. And when the most aggressive imperialist forces, first of all Hitler Germany, unleashed the war, the Soviet people made a decisive contribution to crushing fascism.

Under the present conditions when the imperialist quarters, primarily in the United States, are continuing to rattle their swords and undertake efforts to achieve military superiority over the socialist world, the Soviet Union is also compelled to maintain its own security at the proper level as well as that of its allies. At the same time the CPSU and the Soviet state continue to come out actively in favor of peace on the international scene, acting--according to Lenin--with "as few general statements as possible, as few solemn pledges and fluffy formulas, but with as many of the most simple, clear solutions, and measures that would really lead to peace if not to the complete elimination of the danger of war" (op. cit., vol 45, p 241). The entire policy of our party and state is aimed at implementing into life Lenin's bequest: "...We promise the workers and peasants to do everything possible for peace. And this we shall accomplish" (op. cit., vol 36, p 343).

The Soviet Union has been and remains a partisan of peace and an opponent to predatory wars. It has been and remains an advocate of disarmament, of international detente, of solving controversial issues by peaceful means. The love for peace of Soviet foreign policy is reflected and laid down in the resolutions of the congresses of the party and of its Central Committee plenums, in the decisions of the Soviet government, and in the appeals of the USSR Supreme Soviet. The policy of peace and friendship is the concentrated expression of the will of all Soviet people in international affairs.

"Some time, most likely," Yu. V. Andropov emphasizes, "an exhaustive history of our era will be written. We may be sure that the incontestable fact will be entered with golden letters into this history that without the firm peace-loving policy of the Soviet Union our planet would not only be a far more dangerous place for man to live on, but could very possibly have been stricken by an irreversible misfortune. And if it was possible to avoid this misfortune, if we have lived for almost 40 years in peace, and if we are confident of the future, then the foreign policy of the Soviet Union and its struggle against the threat of a nuclear catastrophe and for life and for the preservation and flourishing of mankind have played and still are playing an enormous role."

It is a characteristic of our foreign policy that it was formed under the direct influence of Lenin--problems affecting the basic interests of peoples and the skill of attaching precisely to these interests the attention of governments and the world public opinion have been advanced into the foreground of international life. The struggle for curbing the arms race and for disarmament is a specific expression of all this.

The aforementioned problem was brought up by our country as early as at the Genoa conference. Already at the first plenum session the delegation of Soviet Russia at Lenin's instruction submitted the proposal for carrying out a general reduction of armaments and the armed forces of all states and for banning barbarous forms of warfare--poisonous gases and means of destruction aimed at peaceful populations.

The Soviet Union firmly maintains the initiative concerning disarmament problems. Not a single state in the world--this can be stated outright--has made such a large contribution to the presentation and elaboration of this problem as the USSR has made and is still making.

Today, just as at the time of Genoa, we naturally realize the difficulties of solving these problems and we realize the obstacles erected by the militaristic quarters in the West. Nevertheless, results have been achieved thanks to the persistent and stubborn struggle of the CPSU and the Soviet state, which to a certain degree are containing the arms race in certain fields.

These results include the treaty banning nuclear arms tests in the atmosphere, in space, and under water; the treaty on principles of the states' activities in researching and utilizing space, including the moon and other celestial bodies; the treaty on the nonproliferation of nuclear arms; the convention banning the exploitation, production, and accumulation of stocks of bacteriological (biological) and toxic weapons and on their destruction; the convention banning the military and other hostile use of means affecting the natural environment; and a number of other accords. The same goals were also pursued by such bilateral Soviet-American accords as the treaty limiting the antimissile defense system and the SALT I treaty. The SALT II treaty, which was signed in 1979 but which has not become valid through the fault of the United States, could also effectively contribute to the cause of peace.

The USSR's historic decision to commit itself unilaterally not to be the first to use nuclear arms, as well as other proposals submitted by the USSR at the second extraordinary UN General Assembly session on disarmament which was held last year, clearly speak of the USSR's endeavor to ward off the threat of a nuclear catastrophe and to achieve realistic results in the disarmament sphere. Currently the Soviet Union is actively pursuing the achievement of mutually acceptable agreements in the Soviet-American negotiations on nuclear arms limitation in Europe, and also those in limiting and reducing strategic arms that are carried out in Geneva. New proposals, which offer a realistic possibility of reaching concrete agreements, were recently submitted by the socialist countries in the Vienna negotiations on reducing armed forces and armaments in Central Europe.

The proposal to conclude a treaty on mutually renouncing the use of military force and on supporting peace relations between Warsaw Pact and NATO pact states, contained in the Political Declaration of the recent session of the Warsaw Pact member states' Political Consultative Committee, also represents a broad-scale initiative.

In coming out with constructive and far-reaching initiatives in the sphere of arms race limitation and disarmament, the Soviet Union expects the Western countries to treat these initiatives in a businesslike manner and with appropriate responsibility.

Lenin attributed serious significance to the utilization of economic levers in the foreign policy of the Soviet state. "There exists a greater force than the wish, will or decision of any hostile government or class," he pointed out, "Namely the force of worldwide general economic relations, which forces them to embark on this path of intercourse with us" (op. cit., vol 44, pp 304-305).

As a champion of the development of mutually advantageous economic contacts with the capitalist states on the basis of equal rights, Lenin clearly saw the goals achieved by this: On the one hand, participation in the international division of labor aided a more rapid upsurge of national economy and the establishment of broad international economic relations; on the other hand, such cooperation set up a material base for the peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems.

At the same time he categorically rejected any and all attempts undertaken by the imperialist forces to dictate their own condition to our country in the sphere of economic relations, and any attempts to impair our economic construction work. Even now the Soviet Union, together with other fraternal countries, is rebuffing in a most principled way all forces which are trying to unleash some kind of commercial, financial, economic war against the states of the socialist community.

The USSR's economic power and the Soviet people's successes in fulfilling the plans outlined by the CPSU for socioeconomic advance represent a reliable support of Soviet foreign policy. "The steady upsurge of the economy, the growth of the people's prosperity," Yu. V. Andropov says, "this is what our duty is, both toward the Soviet Union and also internationally. By formulating the issue in this way, the party follows Lenin's wise directive which stipulates that our main influence on the world revolutionary process is exerted through our economic policy."

Lenin regarded the utilization of interimperialist contradictions as the imperative rule of Soviet foreign policy. He provided an example of such use in the period when the Brest peace was concluded and when it became possible to wrest a breathing space that was so direly needed by our country by making use of one imperialist predator to screen our country off, at least for a while, from other imperialist predators.

Were it not for the art of discerning the trends and shades in bourgeois circles and discrepancies and clashes of interests between the imperialist state, an art coming to us from Lenin, there would have been no anti-Hitler coalition with the participation of the Soviet Union, the United States, England and France. And although, as we know, there was no lack of friction and discord in the coalition, it has remained an example in the memory of the peoples and of history of cooperation between states with different social systems in the fight against a common enemy.

As Lenin said, in pursuing its interests, the bourgeoisie makes use of the fact that "the unfamiliarity of the people's masses with foreign policy is immeasurably more widespread than their ignorance about the domestic sphere." He directed our attention to the fact that the "'secret' of diplomatic relations is held sacred even in the freest of capitalist countries and even in the most democratic of republics" and that the "deception of the people's masses has been artistically elaborated on with regard to the 'affairs' of foreign policy" (op. cit., vol 32, p 335).

One of the first instructions issued by Lenin and carried out by the newly set up Narkomat for foreign affairs was the publication of secret treaties that had been concluded by tsarist Russia. Understandably, the break-off of dealings with secret diplomacy has nothing in common with a narrow philistine view. It would be absurd to fully eliminate confidentiality and secrecy from interstate relations and not to treat with careful secrecy matters which, let us say, concern the elaboration of our foreign political line or the coordination of this line among the socialist states, or else those individual aspects of our relations with friendly states, the publication of which could impair our cause. In cases of necessity, the Soviet government also conducts consultations with capitalist states behind closed doors, and the result of such an exchange of opinions is promulgated later.

The nonacceptance of secret diplomacy means that words do not contradict deeds in the Soviet Union's foreign policy, that our country does pursue the goals which it publicly proclaims for everyone to hear. It can certainly be said that statements coming from the capitals of the imperialist powers contain words about peace, freedom, democracy, independence and people's rights as frequently as our own foreign political documents do. However, the true aim of such pronouncements is to conceal the antipopular aggressive substance of imperialist policy.

What effort the ideologists of capitalism devote to freshening up its facade! What theories they fabricate, so as to pretty up this facade--if the word theories can at all be used for the poverty of their ideas! Nevertheless there is no doubt that, as in the past, it will be impossible to conceal, even less to abolish, the exploiting nature of the capitalist system, of imperialism--which is to blame for the perdition of more than 70 million people in two world wars alone, to say nothing of those maimed. All the gold in the capitalist banks, no matter how bright and shining, cannot cover up the crimes committed by imperialists in the past, committed by them to this day.

Ideological bankruptcy, decay in the intellectual sphere, the crippling of young souls--these are the products of the capitalist society which grew up during more than 3 centuries, and the historical doom of which was shown and substantiated in the works of Marx, Engels, and Lenin.

On the other hand, during the 6.5 decades of its existence socialism has radically changed the face of our country, which has become a powerful great force for peace, as well as the faces of a number of other countries which have embarked on the path of socialist and communist construction. All this did not happen automatically. The achievements of our domestic and foreign

policy are the result of the CPSU's visionary and principled line and of the creative work of the Soviet peoples in building a communist society.

Marxism-Leninism has proved with scientific and irrefutable logic that the transition from capitalism to socialism and communism is an objectively stipulated, inexorably continuing process in the historical advance of human society. The firm and confident march of real socialism confirms this with the utmost convincingness. Real socialism has no need to resort to the use of force to affirm the righteousness of its cause, the justice of its goals, and its supremacy as a social system.

This is also the source of our historical optimism, which also penetrates socialism's foreign policy.

Under the impact of Lenin's revolutionary transforming ideas, deep political and social changes continue to take place in today's world. This is why the fierce attacks undertaken against Leninism by its ideological adversaries are no coincidence. They are incapable of setting up anything against Leninist doctrine except importunate pronouncements saturated with falseness about the "communist danger" and the "Soviet military threat," anything but appeals for an anticommunist "crusade" and various antihumane criminal sermons in favor of militarism and war. And, since this is so, they frequently sink so low as to resort to direct falsification and charlatanism.

In their international activity the CPSU and the Soviet state are making use of the invaluable gift placed in our hands by Lenin--namely, to learn the necessary lessons from the past, to orient ourselves precisely in the present, and to see the future in its scientifically based revolutionary perspective.

The Leninist strategy of the foreign policy of socialism, which is strictly followed by the leadership of our party and the state, encounters the understanding and support of fraternal socialist countries, of all peace-loving states, of the forces of the liberation movement, and for defending the peoples' rights to independence and social progress. Our country will also be consistently striving in the future to carry it into life for the sake of the victory of the cause of socialism, and for the sake of the peaceful future of present and future generations.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1983

CSO: 1802/12

KARL MARX AND THE UNIVERSAL-HISTORICAL PROCESS OF THE LIBERATION OF MAN

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 6, Apr 83 pp 33-47

[Article by V. Zagladin, S. Men'shikov and I. Frolov]

[Text] "Marxism and the Liberation of Man" was the topic of the international colloquium which took place in Paris at the end of last January on the occasion of the 165th anniversary of the birth of K. Marx. It was sponsored by the Institute for Marxist Research of the French Communist Party. The colloquium was attended by Marxist philosophers from 32 countries, including 12 socialist, 11 developing and 9 developed capitalist states. The more than 70 papers and speeches represented a great wealth of shades of meaning and emphases. Not one of them was a confrontation between irreconcilable theoretical and political positions. The encounter proved the unity of the participants on all basic problems of our time.

As planned by the organizers of the colloquium, which was marked by lively and creative Marxist thinking, attention was focused on the theoretical problems created by life in a rapidly changing world. As Comrade Francette Lazard, French Communist Party Central Committee Politburo member noted in her opening address, we are witnessing "a new age in the life of Marxism, its new flight toward the heights of the unprecedented problems facing mankind at the end of the 20th century."

The theme of the symposium was rather broad, covering a wide range of economic, political, social and philosophical problems. Today the universal-historical process of the liberation of man consists of two major subprocesses, so to say. They are, first of all, reaching the humanistic ideals of communism wherever socialism has already won. In this connection, the addresses by the representatives of the socialist countries were convincing and substantive. They described in detail the achievements of real socialism in resolving vital and economic social problems, enhancing material and spiritual standards and ensuring the comprehensive and harmonious development of man.

The same process, however, has another rather important component: the struggle for the liberation of man is at its initial stage, i.e., the stage of revolutionary struggle for the abolition of the system of exploitation of man by man wherever it still exists. In this connection, the Marxists focus their attention on the theoretical problems raised by today's practice of the class struggle in capitalist countries, the problem of the general crisis of

capitalism and the system of contradictions in the contemporary world, in particular, i.e., in the final account, the unity of the global revolutionary process. Such problems are most closely related to the struggle for the liberation of the toiling man. At the same time, the struggle waged by the revolutionary forces in the capitalist countries is already today blending with the struggle for the humanistic ideals of communism. This is an organic and exceptionally acute area of struggle for the minds of the popular masses and their emancipation from anticommunist propaganda. The extensive interpretation of Marxism as a theory of the liberation of man has advanced to the proscenium of the ideological battle under capitalist conditions.

These are the objective characteristics of the revolutionary struggle in capitalist countries which determined the choice of the specific topics selected for discussion by the organizers of the symposium. This also largely determines the theme of the present article. It is not a report on the symposium or an attempt to evaluate it but a set of remarks on some directions followed in the development of Marxist thinking in connection with the requirements of the political and ideological struggle waged in the capitalist countries.

Prometheus--the defender and liberator of mankind--was one of Marx's favorite poetic and social ideals throughout his life. This mythological giant gave the people hope and the divine fire--the light of the mind and knowledge.

Essentially, Marx himself was a Prometheus--a giant in thought and revolutionary action for the sake of the liberation of man and mankind.

We, the supporters and followers of Marx's theory and actions--are filled with incomparable pride at the realization that such a giant of thought and true humanism such as Marx stood at the origins of our outlook and greatest revolutionary liberation of man and mankind. "His name and his cause will survive through the centuries!" This was F. Engels' prophetic conclusion made a century ago at the grave of his great friend.

This prophesy has come true: Marx's cause--his doctrine and revolutionary activities--fructified by V. I. Lenin's genius and the communist party he created, were embodied in the real historical movement of socialism and communism; it became reality in the members of the socialist comity and the ideological banner of the world communist and worker movements, which are fighting for the liberation of mankind from exploiting socioeconomic relations which are standing on its way. Marx's name, linked with that of Lenin, who continued and raised to a new level Marx's doctrine, have become a perpetual part of Marxism-Leninism as an integral science of the ways and methods for the liberation of man, embodying the collective mind of the global communist movement.

The universal-historical process of the liberation of man, as Marx, Engels and Lenin proved, means above all the revolutionary overthrow of capitalism and the establishment of a communist system, in which socialism is a stage of establishment and development. The socioeconomic liberation of man from the chains of exploiting capitalist relations, however, proves to be merely the

beginning of the complex process of molding the new man, which marks the completion of the very process of his liberation as a "species." It was this that Marx always emphasized and which was creatively developed in Lenin's works and the activities of the CPSU and the other fraternal parties in socialist, capitalist and developing countries.

For this reason, today the universal-historical process of mankind's liberation is also a struggle for the solution of the basic and global problems of our time--those of peace and disarmament above all--and a struggle for profound socioeconomic and political changes in the capitalist countries and for the elimination of the economic crisis, a struggle against the exploitation of the working class and all working people, a struggle for democracy and socialism and for reaching true national independence and overcoming the legacy of colonialism in the liberated countries; finally, it is the positive activity of the countries of real socialism in resolving vital economic and social problems, enhancing the material and spiritual living standards of the people and ensuring the comprehensive and harmonious development of man. Within this complex range of problems, which were formulated and resolved by Marx, Engels, Lenin, the CPSU and the global communist and worker movements and the Marxist-Leninist doctrine of the liberation of man, Marxism-Leninism is presented to us as an integral system the profound essence of which organically and inseparably combines scientific, revolutionary and humanistic aspects. It is precisely for this reason that it has become today most practically efficient and intellectually attractive to all progressive people who are acutely experiencing the problems and contradictions of the contemporary world.

The understanding of the processes which constitute the general crisis of capitalism is the starting point in the study of the contemporary situation in the capitalist countries and the ways leading to the revolutionary liberation of mankind from exploitation. Two social systems exist in the contemporary world. One of them--the capitalist--is experiencing a comprehensive crisis. The crisis is spread over all areas--political and ideological, way of life and culture. It is an elementary Marxist truth that the most profound roots and initial manifestations of the crisis may be found in the economy, in the economic base of society. "The highest development of the basis itself," Marx wrote, "...is a point at which the base acquires the type of aspect in which it becomes compatible with the highest development of production process and, therefore, also with the highest development of the individuals (under the conditions of set basis). The moment this point has been reached, any further development becomes a decline and a new development begins on a new base" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch." [Works], vol 46, part II, p 34).

The intensification of the periodic economic crises is a clear indicator of the decline of contemporary capitalism. The last two cyclical production drops--1973-1975 and 1979-1983--have been unquestionably the hardest and longest over the past 4 decades. The cyclical fever which broke out at the turn of the 19th century is once again, in the last quarter of the 20th century, making capitalism shake with increasing gravity.

The interweaving between this disease with what is commonly described as structural crises worsens its gravity. This includes lengthy sectorial overproduction crises which may last a decade or more (in ferrous metallurgy, the textile industry, automobile manufacturing and shipbuilding), as well as crises which are related to underproduction in the extracting sectors to one degree or another (power, raw materials, food), chronic difficulties in trade (inflation, credit-financial and monetary crises), and long-term trends of reduced growth of output and labor productivity.

Marx describes and even classifies the various forms of crises in his "theories of added value." He writes about crises which appear as a result of "disturbances in the initial reproduction phase," i.e., "difficulties in the conversion of commodities into money or their sale." This applies to the cyclical or lengthy sectorial overproduction crises. He further singles out crises occurring "as a result of increased raw material costs" and "difficulties in repurchasing the elements of productive capital." This applies to the power and raw material crises. Finally, Marx indicates crises which break out as a result of the "increased cost of vital means of survival." This applies to present-day inflation and the food crisis (op. cit., vol 26, part II, p 575).

Crises of the second and third type were not typical of the period described by Marx. However, he was able to anticipate and consider them theoretically. They became typical of the contemporary stage in the general crisis of capitalism. Their interweaving with cyclical crises became typical. Each developed capitalist country has its own specific form of such interweaving. It is what the Marxists in these countries describe as the national structural crisis in the economies of American, French, British and Japanese capitalism. All of them are individual cases and forms of manifestation of the general crisis in capitalism.

What has triggered this general crisis situation? It is obvious that it is not the result of any sudden isolated shock, as claimed by bourgeois theoreticians who refer, among others, to the sharp increase in petroleum prices, for today petroleum itself is experiencing a period of "overproduction." Petroleum prices are dropping but the crisis remains and the very decline of such prices is triggering no less panic in capitalist circles than did their increase. Consequently, the reason lies elsewhere.

The worsening of economic circumstances over the past decade is also explained with the manifestation of "lengthy cycles" lasting 45 to 50 years. Theoretically, their existence cannot be excluded. We know that there are periods during which priority is assumed by factors which counteract the declining trend of the average profit norm (increased standard of exploitation, relative decline in the cost of permanent capital elements, and a slowdown and even interruption in the growth of the organic capital structure). Such periods alternate with equally long periods in which average profits decline despite all efforts, thus hindering capitalist reproduction considerably. Such periodicity is largely related to uneven technical progress under capitalism and its periods of acceleration and slowdown. The current period is characterized precisely by a slowdown in technical progress

and a long-term decline of average profit norms. However, could this explain the entire set of difficulties experienced by the contemporary capitalist economy? We doubt it.

But let us go back to Marx's views on the base. Changes in and adaptation of the economic base take place under capitalism as well. By the turn of the 20th century the objective need for the development of production forces made it necessary to convert from free competition to monopoly capitalism. This broadened the framework for production growth and technical progress. As Lenin noted, the development of capitalism became incomparably faster than in the past. This period, however, was short. At the beginning of the 1930s the narrow base on which monopoly rule rested had already violently clashed with the need of society for mass production and mass consumption. The result was the "Great Depression" of the 1930s.

The capitalist system reacted to this conflict with further changes in the base and the growth of monopoly into state-monopoly capitalism. It countered the social production anarchy, worsened by the monopolies, by efforts at organizing a centralized control of social overproduction. Keynesianism blossomed--a bourgeois science on how to increase overall social demand with the help of the state and make it consistent with production possibilities. We are familiar with the results: 3 decades of accelerated production growth were followed by a new slowdown in growth rates, increased crises, appearance of chronic high inflation, unparalleled increase in unemployment, systematic underutilization of capacities, dissemination of the toxin of economic militarization and the militarization of science. State control proved weak and the bankruptcy of Keynesianism and other theories on which control was based became universally acknowledged. The state-monopoly base has clearly become obsolete. However, how will it develop further?

Marx discovered the law of dynamics within capitalism, leading to increased levels of production centralization and socialization of labor (see op. cit., vol 23, p 773). Under contemporary capitalism production concentration has long crossed national boundaries. The first international monopolies appeared by the turn of the century. However, it is only during the last 2 decades that the development of international specialization and production cooperation made multinational corporations a typical form of capital internationalization. The new level of concentration matured in the 1970s. Multinational banks, which were organized by multinational financial capital and the multinational financial oligarchy, became widespread along with multinational industrial monopolies. A multinational state-monopoly capitalism appeared on the basis of their merger with the state and with intergovernmental associations. Multinational military-industrial complexes developed and the international alliances of the most reactionary political circles became unified.

The growth of state-monopoly capitalism in its multinational aspect objectively represents the aspiration to exceed the narrow limits of national economic control, to smooth the contradictions and conflicts among national monopolies and governments on the world markets, monetary relations and the

struggle for raw material and energy sources, and to develop a common line in economic relations with socialist and liberated countries.

The Trilateral Commission, representing the ruling circles of the United States, Western Europe and Japan, which was created on the initiative of the Rockefeller and other financial groups in the United States, has been drafting a program for action in this area over the past several years. H. Kissinger, former secretary of state and now multinational business consultant, reflecting the interests of these circles, wrote recently in his article "Rescuing the World Economy": "There will be no upswing if the various members of the industrial world continue to pursue incompatible courses... The industrial (i.e., the capitalist--the author) countries must reach an unprecedented level of coordination of their economic policies." Unable to restrain himself, he went on to say that "as the strongest country America must assume a leadership role."

Despite such appeals, the matter of coordinating economic policy among capitalist countries is progressing extremely slowly. It is virtually at the zero point. The reason lies mainly in the fact that the internationalization and cosmopolitan development of capitalism did not eliminate the rivalry among national monopolies and multinational business groups. Furthermore, the intensity of interimperialist contradictions has worsened more than ever before in recent years. In all main areas--trade, monetary relations and credit-financial policy--one fierce battle after another is being fought. There is no major economic problem on which the positions of the Western countries agree. Under the conditions of a profound and protracted economic crisis no single competing country or group is willing or able to sacrifice its profits or risk an aggravation of domestic social contradictions. As Lenin predicted, in opposing Kautskiy's theory of "ultrainternationalism," even the "international unification of financial capitalism" cannot exclude "frictions, conflicts and struggle in any and all possible forms..." ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 27, p 417).

The most important reason for such increased contradictions is the growth of the expansionistic and aggressive aspirations of American imperialism, which is trying to make use of international capital above all for the sake of establishing its own diktat and leadership in economic and political affairs and for increasing its exploitation of other, including developing, countries. The domestic and foreign policy course of the current U.S. administration reflects precisely such reactionary trends. The unconcealed "Reaganomics" program represents an unprecedented acceleration of the nuclear arms race at home and among its allies; the organization of "social revenge" against socialism and the forces of national liberation in the international arena; attempts at "class revenge" against the toiling masses through an unparalleled pressure on their real income and reduction of social appropriations; finally, a line of suppressing rivals in the interimperialist competition. This too is a program of multinational capital. However, it is waged mainly by its most conservative, militaristic and revenge-minded detachments. They consider the slogans of "Social Well-Being" and "Coordination of Actions Among Sovereign Countries" a hopeless obsolescence which must be decisively cast on the dump of history.

One cannot fail to see the tremendous danger to the working people and all mankind of this direction pursued by multinational capitalism. It brings to the people a sharp increase in the threat of thermonuclear catastrophe. It threatens the working class and the working people in the capitalist countries with a drop in living standards, loss of social gains achieved as a result of previous class struggles and a reduction to a level which entirely ignores the contemporary material and spiritual requirements of the working people and clashes with their role as the main social production force. It brings the liberated countries a perpetuation of backwardness and restoration of open colonialist and neocolonialist rules. It threatens even the developed capitalist countries with deprivation of national sovereignty and independence.

However, this adventuristic course which pits itself against the majority of the earth's population is contributing to the aggravation of all contradictions within the contemporary world, thus dooming itself to defeat. Reactionary cosmopolitan capitalism neither has nor could have any future.

The capitalist crisis today has trapped in its orbit not only basic relations but all aspects of life in the capitalist society. That is why the communists sharply raise the question of the fact that the crisis in the capitalist production method is also a crisis affecting the totality of human relations, such as labor, school, family, morality, politics, culture and the very concept of the meaning of life under capitalism. This raises the even more general question of the nature of contradictions within contemporary capitalism and their connection with the universal-historical process of man's liberation.

In his study of the specific system of contradictions which determine the dynamics of the capitalist system, initially upwards and subsequently toward its decline and doom, Marx singled out two of them in particular: the contradiction between production, which objectively is assuming an increasingly social nature (going as far as its internationalization) and private appropriation, which is backward in nature; in the social area, the corresponding contradiction between labor and capital or, as he wrote, between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat: "This contradiction..." Engels noted, "already contains embryonically all the conflicts of our time" (op. cit., vol 9, p 214). The resolution of precisely this contradiction above all will mean, according to Marx, the elimination of exploitation relations, i.e., the meeting of the key condition for the liberation of man.

The "bourgeois-proletarian" contradiction is the basic social contradiction within capitalism as a system. It has been manifested within individual countries and, although considerably less clearly, internationally. It was during that period that intercapitalist contradictions and the competitive struggle which, as Marx frequently said, leads to "war of all against all," appeared most emphatically and noticeably in the world arena.

Lenin continued the study of the contradictions within the capitalist system started by Marx, justifiably considering it a necessary source for enriching the science of proletarian socialism. In his study of the highest and final stage of capitalist development--imperialism--he emphasized, on the one hand, the new and substantially higher level of production socialization and internationalization and, on the other, the intensification and, on this basis, development of contradictions between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie (both sides of which substantially developed and changed). Under the new conditions this contradiction assumed an international nature. Now, Lenin wrote, it was already a question of the antagonism between the "internationally merged capital with the international labor movement" ("Poln. Sobl. Soch.", vol 25, p 264).

At the same time Lenin proved that on the basis of the fundamental social contradiction within the capitalist system and along with it a new social contradiction appeared and developed: between the monopolies and the people, which laid the foundation for the growth of broad democratic movements for the developing rapprochement between the struggle for democracy and that for socialism.

Lenin also profoundly studied yet another contradiction triggered by the conditions of imperialism and of exceptionally profound and revolutionary-explosive nature: the contradiction between mother countries and colonies. His conclusion was that in the future, in the long term, this contradiction will become closer to and interwoven with the basic social contradiction of the capitalist system and that the peoples fighting colonial rule will, in the final account, turn increasingly against capitalism.

Finally, Lenin witnessed the birth of the new contradiction in world development, which was the extension of the "bourgeois-proletarian" contradiction on a new level: the "socialism-capitalism" contradiction. Understandably, during Lenin's lifetime this contradiction was at the initial stages in its dynamics. However, already then Lenin was able perspicaciously to see the birth of the new basic antagonism as the new motive force in global history in the period of transition of mankind from capitalism to socialism started with the October Revolution.

Subsequent to the formulation of these conclusions new features developed in the nature of the dynamics of capitalist contradictions and in the forms through which they found their specific manifestation.

We can generally say that the dynamics of these contradictions have been characterized over the past 6 decades by three features: first, their enrichment: new contradictions appeared, which substantially influenced the entire course of world history; some "old" contradictions experienced a certain differentiation. Secondly, a process of interweaving, rapprochement, a kind of integration took place among global development contradictions. Thirdly, both "old" and "new" contradictions of this kind intensified, which accelerated the pace of social progress. Above all, during the past decade the main contradiction of our age--the contradiction between socialism and capitalism--developed significantly. Its role as the leading contradiction

in contemporary global developments is determined by the fact that, on the one hand, it indicates the basic direction of social progress and, on the other, by virtue of this fact is exerting an increasingly noticeable effect on the dynamics of all other contradictions in our epoch.

This contradiction developed both quantitatively and qualitatively. In the quantitative sense, in 1917 the ratio of forces between its two confronting forces were essentially in favor of imperialism; socialism, represented by Soviet Russia alone, was actually a fortress besieged from all sides, repelling the attacks of the class enemy with difficulty. In 1983 socialism, which accounts for one-third of all mankind in terms of several quantitative indicators--economic, scientific and technical and military--is the equal of its opponent--imperialism. Qualitatively, it is a question of an increasingly obvious conversion of socialism into the most influential and, in the future, decisive factor in universal history.

This precisely is the reason for the current unusual aggravation of contradictions between imperialism and socialism. It is a question of imperialism's effort to turn back or at least stop the march of history, in the course of which it is not abandoning even the most adventuristic ways and means threatening the future of mankind, including reliance on nuclear blackmail and the threat of unleashing a nuclear war.

This is not astounding, for the entire transition from capitalism to socialism is not a "regular" historical step from one system to another. It is a double transition from a lower to a higher social system and from an era of thousands of years of domination of private ownership to one of the total liberation of mankind from all types of social or other types of oppression.

The development of contradictions between socialism and capitalism, naturally, not only did not eliminate the basic social contradiction within the capitalist world ("bourgeois-proletarian") but, conversely, contributed to its further dynamics. The growth of world socialism objectively influenced both sides of the contradiction. On the one hand, it strengthened the positions of the working class, and contributed to the strengthening within it of the conviction that replacing capitalism with socialism (in one form or another or at one pace or another) is a realistic target and the struggle waged by the proletariat is historically substantiated and promising. On the other hand, the growth of socialism weakened the positions of capitalism in its confrontation with the working class.

The socioeconomic changes in capitalist society, related to the consequences of the scientific and technical revolution and the mentioned intensification of the process of socialization of production and labor intensified (and deepened) the "bourgeois-proletarian" contradiction. These changes affected mainly the working class which increased numerically (until it became the social majority in Europe, America, Japan and the most developed Latin American countries); the working class grew spiritually and, as far as its vanguard is concerned, ideologically and politically as well. At the same time, it became internally differentiated. Its stratification increased and its strata bordering the bourgeoisie became more numerous (which frequently

hindered the manifestation of the revolutionary potential of the proletariat as a class as a whole).

However, the changes affected the bourgeois class as well. Here, conversely, it became a question of its numerical reduction and the development within it, on the one hand, of an increasingly small "upper" stratum of magnates of monopoly and international monopoly capital and, on the other, masses nominally independent but actually totally dependent on the big "bosses," balancing on the brink of bankruptcy.

The developing crisis and the growth of unemployment, which is turning a considerable segment of the toiling population (as high as 10 percent!) into "declassé people," with no future are also substantially changing the social aspect of contemporary capitalism and worsening its inherent contradictions.

Finally, a further and truly unprecedented deepening of the gap between the interests and actions of the upper crust of monopoly capital and the overwhelming majority of the people is taking place. Marx's conclusion becomes particularly relevant today: "...Capitalist production is ... a historical form of social development,... clashing with the interests of the part of the population which represents the foundation of this entire development" (K. Marx and F. Engels, op. cit., vol 26, part III, p 270). This substantially broadens the base for general democratic currents and movements and for the broadest possible unification of antimonopoly leftist forces and the further drawing together of the struggle for democracy and the struggle for socialism.

As we mentioned, in the imperialist age the contradiction between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat becomes internationalized. Today this process has entered a new development stage manifested in an increasing variety of forms.

First, it is the continuing swelling of the ranks of the working class not only in the socialist and developed capitalist countries but, increasingly, in the former colonial world. Marx noted that in principle the existence of a proletariat is possible only "in the universal-historical sense." Today the working class indeed exists in a worldwide "universal-historical" scale and the entire world has become the realm of its social activeness. Consequently, the realm of action of the "bourgeoisie-proletarian" contradiction also factually covers the entire world, both objectively and subjectively.

Second, the development of the international worker movement, the growth of the world communist movement above all and the strengthened ranks of trade union federations acting virtually on all continents means, as a whole, the true internationalization of the struggle of the working class.

Third, today the new step in the process of the practical internationalization of the class struggle of the working class is related to the appearance and development of multinational monopolies. The internationally merged capital is acting against the working class simultaneously in several countries, developed and developing. Naturally, this triggers the international counteraction of the workers.

The internationalization of the main social contradiction in capitalism objectively calls for strengthening the international interconnections among the different detachments of working people. This does not mean the disappearance of some problems which hinder the organization of such interrelationships. Consequently, particularly important today is the thorough consideration of the national interests and characteristics of the different working class detachments and the organization of their interaction in a way which will not harm such interests but would show respect for their characteristics. The various forms of existence and struggle, interests and features of the different working class detachments are actually not a factor for its disunity (although sometimes it is used precisely to this effect) but a factor which ensures the greater efficiency of its overall efforts.

The contradiction between mother countries and colonies continued to develop. Strictly speaking, it is no longer accurate to give this contradiction its old name, for the majority of former colonial countries are now independent and the colonial system no longer exists in its classical features.

Essentially, however, nothing has changed. Imperialism is continuing to exploit the former colonies, today liberated countries, through different methods. As in the past, in Marx's words, it appropriates some of their added labor "giving nothing in exchange" (op. cit., vol 46, part II, p 384). This being the case, we still have a sharp clash between imperialism and its policy of oppressing the peoples of the developing countries and exploiting their natural resources, on the one hand, and the developing countries and their peoples, which are aspiring to full, including economic, liberation and to surmounting the economic backwardness resulting from colonial domination, on the other.

This contradiction is manifested in a variety of ways. One of the most noticeable among them is the demand raised by the developing countries for a new world economic order, i.e., essentially a demand for the elimination of neocolonialism and the democratization of international economic relations.

It is quite essential that the contradiction between the developing countries and imperialism is experiencing a certain differentiation. On the one hand, as some developing countries choose a socialist orientation, prerequisites appear for the transformation of this contradiction into a contradiction between socialism and capitalism. In other words, a process is under way of bringing closer the contradictions between the developing countries and imperialism, on the one hand, and those between socialism and capitalism, on the other. It is precisely this process that determines the gradual rapprochement between developing countries with a socialist orientation and the members of the socialist comity.

The other aspect is the development of a number of former colonies along the capitalist way, even including the appearance of their own monopoly capital. The contradictions between such developing countries and imperialism unquestionably remain. However, they assume a different shape. Essentially we have here the development of competition elements on capitalist grounds, for the anti-imperialist political line followed by said countries is unquestionable.

The complexity of the contradictions within the former colonial world require a profound study. Unquestionably, however, here as well, precisely as in the developed capitalist countries, the social development processes are intensifying and accelerating.

Particular attention should be paid to a new group of contradictions in world development, which Marx and Lenin discussed in a general manner, but which was manifested specifically in our time only or, more accurately, in the 1960s-1970s. This applies to the group of contradictions which could be conventionally described as those between imperialism and the rest of mankind.

Noteworthy on this level is what is usually known as the global problems of our time. This includes, above all, the threat of nuclear war, which would threaten the existence of civilization as a whole. It also includes such problems as surmounting economic backwardness and eliminating hunger and poverty, particularly in the developing countries. Finally, it includes a group of problems affecting relations between man and nature.

Some of the problems which were described today as global arose as a result of not compensating nature for the harm caused through anthropogenic activities. A large number of them, however, were the result of antagonistic social relations, national oppression and wars, some of them global. The political relevance of the global problems lies in the fact that without their solution not only further progress but the very existence of mankind becomes virtually impossible.

Imperialism is the obstacle which prevents their solution. It not only worsens existing problems but seems to concentrate them, raising them to a catastrophic scale and threatening the very existence of civilization.

In other words, today not only the internal development processes in the individual capitalist countries but global development as a whole confirm the vital need for most profound social change and for a revolutionary solution of the contradictions created by capitalism. It is only through revolutionary change that mankind, in Marx's words, will be able to reach a true solution of the contradictions between men, between the individual and the species and between man and nature (op. cit., vol 42, p 116). The forms of social change were, are and will remain infinitely varied. Not one of them could be canonized or turned into a fetish. Essentially, however, it is and must remain a question precisely of most profound social changes on a global scale.

Such changes are not triggered arbitrarily, on someone's order, but develop gradually, in the course of social development itself. Social changes take place, as a rule, not internationally but within nations. This means that although socialism alone can provide a radical solution to the problem, one cannot wait for its ubiquitous victory. A solution based on present social conditions must be found. It is precisely socialism and the developing countries who are offering such a solution: comprehensive development of all-round peaceful cooperation.

We can say in general that so far the threat to the future of mankind has been growing exponentially. Now it is a question of ensuring another exponential development by the people and their mass organizations through international interaction in favor of peace and progress--the exponential development of the liberation struggle, of the struggle for democratization of international relations and the prevention of war.

The broadest possible unification of all social forces existing in the contemporary world can be really ensured on the basis of this platform. Essentially it is a question of the struggle for the salvation of mankind. Today the task of this struggle appears to be essentially of a general democratic nature. This is indeed the case. However, the essence of the problems which must be resolved and their close connection with the social progress needed to this effect are gradually ascribing a greater social meaning to the global problems, the struggle for their solution and the contradiction between imperialism and the rest of mankind.

In other words, the situation within the capitalist world is duplicated in the international arena: the struggle for democracy is increasingly getting closer to the struggle for socialism. This rapprochement process is exceptionally fruitful and promising. Unquestionably, however, since it is largely spontaneous, it requires the active role of the subjective factor i.e., of man himself as he struggles for his liberation. Here again the Marxist-Leninist understanding of the social essence of man and the ways leading to his liberation as an individual, dialectically combined with society and with the economic, social and spiritual aspects of his activities play a tremendous role.

Marx's greatest merit is the fact that he theoretically discovered and substantiated the entire universal-historical process of the liberation of man on a scientific basis. He indicated the main source and motive force of this process which consists of the revolutionary reorganization of the entire system of socialist social relations in the direction of socialism and communism. In the course of developing this fundamental Marxian conclusion, Lenin subjected to withering criticism theoretical and practical-political approaches according to which man's nature is immutable and afflicted by private ownership and other innate faults, which make building socialism a utopia, for, it is claimed, one must begin by developing some kind of special people who would represent a "new material" for socialism. In this connection Lenin wrote that "we want to build socialism out of people who were raised under capitalism, who were wasted and corrupted by it but who were also tempered in the struggle.... We want to build socialism specifically with the material left to us by capitalism now, and not with people who will be raised in greenhouses, entertaining as this fable may sound" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.", vol 38, p 54).

Under contemporary conditions, these scientific Marxist-Leninist conclusions are being theoretically and practically implemented in the activities of the CPSU and the other fraternal parties in the socialist countries. They have become the conceptual base of Marxist-Leninist humanistic strategy throughout the world in their struggle for man's socioeconomic and spiritual liberation and development.

Marx's thesis to the effect that the essence of man "is not an abstract inherent in the individual" provides a methodological key to the scientific understanding of these problems. It is actually a totality of social relations" (K. Marx and F. Engels, op. cit., vol 42, p 265). It would be difficult to find in the history of human thought a broader and more meaningful formula than this one. It is historically significant because it allowed us to surmount once and for all one-sided anthropologism, which considers the problems of man, his liberation and development in an absolutized "atomic" form, paralleled by abstract-philosophical or biosocial reductionisms; Marx's formula organically combined these problems with the materialistic understanding of history, the class struggle of the proletariat, the theory of the revolution and the doctrine of socialism and communism as a truly human society in which man finds the social forms of realization of himself consistent with his nature.

Today, under the conditions of the domination of schematic concepts of man in bourgeois ideology, invariably suffering from a one-sided view of man, Marx's understanding of man's problems represent the most consistent and entirely scientific and integral concept on which the universal-historical process of man's liberation and development is based. As Marx emphasizes, "a coincidence between changes in circumstances and human activities may be considered and indeed be rationally understood only in terms of revolutionary practice" (op. cit., vol 3, p 2).

The fact that man is essentially defined as a "reduced society" while society is defined as "expanded man" provides a scientific answer to the "age-old" problem of the correlation between social and natural-biological factors, thus eliminating a number of biologizing, neo-Eugenic and other ideas which are used in an attempt to draw social thinking away from the main and essential feature--social activity for the sake of man's liberation and development. Such ideas do not take into consideration the fact, as Marx proved, of natural-biological factors (the significance of which is by far not denied by Marxism) which operate within man in his reorganized "cut-down" aspect, and that there is a dialectical gradation and reorganization of the natural-biological social aspect, for "human objects are not natural objects as directly found in nature..." (op. cit., vol 42, p 164). In this light, today Marx's theory to the effect that the center of unity and interaction between natural-biological and social features is the object activity of man as the social being assumes tremendous importance. Since according to Marx society is "man himself in his social relationships" (op. cit., vol 46, part II, p 222), here it is a question precisely of the "appropriation of human reality" (op. cit., vol 42, p 120), in the course of which the process of development of the sum total of human needs and capabilities takes place, shaped through object forms and the ways and means of culture--labor, language, habits, skills, knowledge, artistic creativity, and so on.

Consequently, the process of man--of his establishment and development--becomes, according to Marx, the appropriation and reproduction by the individual of the sociohistorical experience of mankind and its material and spiritual culture in the course of his contacts with other people and involvement in the sociocultural progress of mankind, and in the course of the

training, upbringing and development of man himself. Such a historical approach enables us not only scientifically to understand the legitimacy of the establishment and development of man but also properly to structure the strategy of molding the individual, consistent in terms of essential qualities, with the new requirements raised by the contemporary processes of the scientific and technical revolution and the real conditions and ideals of socialism and communism. Marx's theory of the social nature of man here again becomes a key feature, for it follows from it that, as we study human social relations, we bring to light the real vital relations of the individual. This was properly emphasized by Lenin who, as he raised the question of "the characteristics on the basis of which we can judge the real "feelings and thoughts" of real individuals, answered that "it is understandable that the only characteristic is the actions of such individuals and, since it is a question of social "thoughts and feelings" only, we should add to this the social actions of the individual," i.e., social facts" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," vol 1, pp 423-424).

The social actions of the individual, which Lenin described, are also a prerequisite for their development which assumes its proper forms only in a society in which "the development of the wealth of human nature" becomes "self-seeking" (Marx), a society which ensures the absolute discovery of the "creative talents of man with no prerequisites other than previous historical developments, which make this integral development a self-seeking aim, i.e., the development of all human forces as such regardless of any previously established scale. In this case man does not reproduce himself in a specific aspect but in his entirety. He does not try to be established once and for all but is in a state of absolute dynamics in his establishment" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Works," vol 46, part I, p 476).

Such an integral development is not available to the elite. As Marx underscored, "although initially this took place at the expense of the majority of individuals and even entire human classes, in the final account, the elimination of this antagonism coincides with the development of the separate individual..." (op. cit., vol 26, part II, p 123). The revolutionary overthrow of capitalist exploitation relations and the transition to communism will create the type of social conditions under which "the free development of one is a prerequisite for the free development of all" (op. cit. vol 4, p 447). As we know, in correcting Plekhanov's draft of our party's first program, Lenin especially emphasized that the new society and its organization are being created "in order to ensure the full well-being and free all-round development of all members of society" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," vol 6, p 232).

This truly humanistic process is profoundly and scientifically substantiated in Marxism-Leninism.

If we try to describe briefly its main outlines, we could sum them up in the following interrelated theses:

1. The economic and social liberation of man means that the working person is no longer the target of exploitation or an appendix to the production process but becomes a creator, a builder. The elimination of capitalist

production erases the alienation of the worker from productive capital. Unity in the "man-labor tool" and "man-nature" is achieved on a very high level of production forces which makes it possible to ensure the all-round harmonious development of the individual.

2. Real savings, i.e., working time economy, blend with the development of production forces and of production capabilities. The enhancement of labor productivity leads not to forced unemployment but to facilitating labor, enriching its meaning, upgrading its quality and developing the capabilities of the working person.

3. "For a man in the process of developing this direct production process is also a school of discipline, but for the developed person who already has acquired the knowledge gained by society, it means utilization (knowledge), experimental science, material creativity and the tangible embodiment of science" (K. Marx and F. Engels, op. cit., vol 46, part II, p 221). In other words, from a heavy duty the labor process becomes a process of creativity and of moral upbringing and development of man.

4. Production and consumption are two inseparable parts of a unit, two facets of the new man which become apparent in the course of the labor process. The elimination of contradictions between production and consumption "does not mean in the least a rejection of consumption but the development... of capabilities for production and, therefore, the development of both capabilities for consumption as well as consumption means. The ability to consume...is a development of an individual gift, of a production force" (ibid.).

5. "Working time economy is equivalent to an increase in leisure time, i.e., the time for the type of full development of the individual which, in turn, as the greatest production force, has a reverse impact on the productive force of labor. From the viewpoint of the direct production process working time economy may be considered as the output of productive capital which is man himself" (ibid.). The bourgeois theoreticians, however, discovered the "human capital" only more than 100 years after Marx and only as a new and occasionally profitable investment of capital. The humanistic aspect of the matter is totally lacking in them, as can be seen from the study of anthropological concepts which are considered fashionable today in the West. As a rule, they are merely repeating the ideas which were criticized and scientifically and positively surmounted by Marx and his followers in their time.

Therefore, Marx determined and real socialism proved in practical terms the complex chain saturated with feedbacks: creative nature of labor-working time economy-development of production capabilities-development of personal consumption as an aspect in the development of the individual-increased leisure time and full development of the individual. The crowning object here is man, the person, his freedom and development. Marx, followed by Lenin and his own followers today have had to do a tremendous amount of mental work to reach this greatest of all discoveries. However, an equally tremendous amount of work was required by action--the practice of molding the person in the entire variety of his features and manifestations.

Undertaking the solution of this universal-historical problem, the Marxist-Leninists faced a set of new theoretical problems related to defining the specific ways and methods for the education of the new man and the need to surmount age-old prejudices and traditions, cultural backwardness and underdevelopment, and the humiliation of the working people inherited from the past. Practical experience revealed a number of theoretically unforeseen features; the Marxist-Leninist concept of man in terms of his relationship with society, following the path to communism and the molding of the new man--the product of this social development and its main motive force--developed in the course of a dialectical interaction between theory and practice.

The dialectics of the development of the new man is such that, on the one hand, all successes achieved by socialism in the economic, social and cultural areas depend on him. On the other hand, the shaping of the new man itself is objectively determined by the level of the production process, the nature of labor, social relations and cultural standards. Such a dialectical understanding is the foundation of the strategy of the CPSU and the Soviet state in the social area and in the development of the individual. It was embodied in the resolutions of the 26th CPSU Congress, which formulated an efficient and thought-out program for the development of socialist social relations leading to the manifestation of the essential forces of man and his future: intensive economic development based on scientific and technical progress, improved management and strengthened conscious labor discipline, elimination of class differences and major disparities between town and country and manpower and physical labor, strengthened social homogeneity, comprehensive development of and rapprochement among all nations and nationalities in the USSR and development of socialist democracy and a socialist way of life.

The subsequent CPSU Central Committee decrees, the November 1982 CPSU Central Committee Plenum, and the stipulations formulated in the speech delivered at the plenum by Comrade Yu. V. Andropov, CPSU Central Committee general secretary, formulated new assignments in developing production, resolving social problems, shaping the new man and advancing his professional qualities, labor discipline, consciousness and morality. Many unresolved problems remain in these areas, which must be and are being resolved as demanded by a society the slogan of which is "Everything for the Sake of Man, for the Good of Man." If we were to sum up and combine all of these problems, we could say that the main feature here is a purposeful and comprehensive development of man as an individual. This means the enhancement of his standard in the broadest meaning of the term.

Clearly, a great deal remains to be done by our scientists as well in the truly comprehensive study of the ways leading to the shaping of the new man and the new communist civilization. The 26th CPSU Congress emphasized the need of precisely such an approach. It is the duty of the Marxist scientists in both the social and the other sciences to answer this party stipulation with action.

As we may see, starting with the general theoretical definitions provided by Marx and the Marxist-Leninists on the nature, ways, means, problems and

contradictions in the universal-historical process of the liberation of mankind, we have inevitably reached the level of practical human problems, as they are opposed and resolved in the socialist society progressing on the way to communism. This is understandable, for the very nature and profound essence of Marx's theory demand not only to explain but to change man in the world and the world of man. This is a clear manifestation of the true humanism of Marxism, which combines science with practical efficiency. That is precisely why Marx described it as real humanism. It is precisely Marxism which today assumes the greatest mission of implementing the universal-historical task of man's liberation and development. It is precisely Marxism which is synonymous with humanism in the eyes of all progressive mankind. What Prometheus accomplished in mythology, Marx and his followers--the Marxist-Leninists the world over--are accomplishing in science and real life.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1983

5003

CSO: 1802/12

V. I. LENIN: 'THESE ARE THE LOFTY TASKS OF WHICH I AM DREAMING...'

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 6, Apr 1983 pp 48-57

[Article by V. Chikin on the occasion of the 60th anniversary of Lenin's last works (December 1922-March 1923)]

[Text] In mid-December 1922 the severe disorder which had long been sapping Vladimir Il'ich's strength suddenly became much worse, confining him to bed and completely preventing him from crossing the threshold of his apartment and getting to his desk. The whole world suddenly shrank to a simple homely bed with the rug that had belonged to his mother: It was all there--a hospital ward, a reading room, a working study.... And a couple of paces from the threshold, so it seemed, reaching to the Pacific itself--the vital arteries of life on an earth jolted upright by the revolution. His closes comrades, the party and all Russia, both the familiar Russia and that still unknown, awaited Il'ich's decisive comments, advice and parting words.

They had only just endured the intolerable burdens of the hell of the front. They had also overcome the previous year's famine. They were working out their own state system. They had won diplomatic status--even their enemies had agreed to recognize their rights in the world arena. High time then to set about the economy and, most importantly, to check on the finer points of the first few steps toward socialism. In the summary of the 10th All-Russian Congress of Soviets speech which was never delivered, Lenin stressed in particular the words 'how to approach socialism.' Vladimir Il'ich wanted to provide each communist, worker and peasant, wherever he may be, with the living example of practical deeds--look into this, act like that! Of course the party is armed with the theory of scientific socialism, of course there are program guidelines and specifically outlined prospects. But Marx's words were borne out more than ever before: any practical progress is more important than a dozen programs. Socialism, Vladimir Il'ich said in his final speech, is no abstract painting, no icon painted in solemn colors--it is real human existence and all is now being resolved amidst everyday questions. There was much that Vladimir Il'ich still wanted to think through and finish saying....

Although confined to bed by illness and strict medical instructions, he did not lose hope of delivering his thoughts at the crucial party and soviet auditorium where he was impatiently awaited. He painstakingly prepared to address Russia's legislators on the eve of the unification of the republics into the Union of Soviets. He seemed to long for spring 1923--it marked the approach of the new party congress to which it was so important to bring the

early experience and first few lessons of world socialist practice. Some 2 months before the 12th Congress opened he began asking the doctors whether he would be able to speak there, and on receiving a negative reply, could not hide his disappointment. That inability to be among one's comrades, together with people who need one so much, was the most painful thing of all. Life was agonizingly empty without those eager, demanding and inspired people, without the seething tide of congresses and meetings. In politics it is extremely important, Lenin believed, to be at the center of the human whirlpool at the decisive moment, to find and express the only necessary word and to exert personal influence on minds and circumstances. There is no political activity without this....

Sometimes medicine is powerless to help and does not dare make exact prognoses. You can receive long months and years of treatment and suddenly everything stops...Vladimir Il'ich saw that he had to hurry. And then, when the illness became much worse, asked for a stenographer to be appointed so that he could record the thoughts that concerned him....

He then resolutely insisted that his doctors and comrades should allow him, despite tremendous risk, to dictate his "diary" even if only for a few minutes a day. That was how his final dialogue with the future began.

For nearly 10 weeks--from the end of December 1922 to the beginning of March 1923--the selfless feat of true spiritual greatness--a most rare example of human courage and wisdom--continued. Lenin's final works replenished his creative legacy. Those works are: "Letter to the Congress" (with the special supplements "On the Attribution of Legislative Functions to Gosplan" and the "Section on Increasing the Number of Central Committee Members," "The Nationalities Question, or 'Autonomization,'" "Pages From a Diary," "On Cooperation," "On Our Revolution (Apropos of the Notes of N. Sukhanov)," "How We Must Reorganize the Rabkrin [Workers' and Peasants' Inspectorate] (A Proposal to the 12th Party Congress)," and "Better Fewer But Better." The chapters of Lenin's "Diary" appear uncoordinated and multithematic but essentially represent a single work--a distinctive "political testament" as communists call it. It is here that Vladimir Il'ich brings into focus the conclusions and tenets of his previous works and completes the development of the great plan of socialist construction in the land of the soviets, setting out a precise program of social transformations in Russia within the entirety of the prospects of the world revolutionary and liberation movement.

There will be a socialist Russia...emphasizing these words, he ended his last public speech. Day by day the main avenues of the most strenuous work become clearer and more certain. Those avenues included the building of a major machine industry, the electrification program and the construction of projects like the Volkhovskaya GES. They included the organization of cooperativization in Russia and the rebuilding of the countryside on collectivist principles. They included the path of a most profound cultural revolution. It all became clearer as a prospect and more complex as a matter of day-to-day practice.

Is the pace at which we are hastening toward the new system not too fast, Vladimir Il'ich wondered? Will the heady successes not take their toll? The good things that have emerged and taken shape in the social system have still not been thought out clearly, not understood, not felt deeply, not tested, not confirmed by experience, not consolidated.... How are we all to make ourselves absorb that healthy distrust of recklessly rapid progress and of all forms of the vainglory and to compel ourselves to ponder the verification of those steps that we proclaim by the hour, take by the minute and then prove by the second to be precarious. How hard it is for the working man to see the sense of his own small deed in the course of events and to feel himself the master of all that we have if we cannot feel that ourselves. This may take a long time to catch on.

Excessive haste and the vainglory must be countered by realism and quality. Vladimir Il'ich seems to have nurtured the inner meaning of his final works for years. Now he was focusing his attention on the main thing: quality--whether in the organization of labor, the rebuilding of the state apparatus, or the acquisition of manpower--must be our legitimate concern. "...One thing must be placed above any and all considerations--the interests of truly exemplary quality" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 45, p 392). Better fewer but of higher quality--that is the practical rule for all who want to manage in a socialist manner.

Our state and national economy must be built with the utmost thrift by resolutely banishing from public relations all trace of excess. Does this not smack of peasant meanness? No, this is social rationalism. Only the productiveness of the people's labor and thrifty management will enable the new Russia to quickly exchange the muzhik's poor nag for the horse of a large machine industry and electrification.

Our practical approach to the economy and our particular form of rationalism must under no circumstances become a creeping pragmatism. May the mighty wings of dreams and social ideals always beat. That clear sense of the organic fusion of specific present-day deeds and clearly perceived distant aims, that vital realism and that radicalism that breaks old chains--that is what Vladimir Il'ich wanted very much to convey to his fellow thinkers and builders of communism; he wanted to warn them against phrase-mongering and verbal self-deception, and wanted to lead them onto the path of revolutionary practical action.

It was at that time, just a few days before completing work on his final article, that Vladimir Il'ich recalled how, in the squalid reality of the bad old days, Russians would deliver themselves of unusually bold theoretical constructs. This became customary and acquired a highly one-sided character. With unprecedented daring they would examine projects for worldwide land revolution but were shackled by timidity in the face of an extremely necessary minor reform. What is the way out of this contradiction? We need no abstract striving after what is new, but rather after what is completely specific, businesslike and progressive.

Socialist Russia was inconceivable without a radical solution of the peasant question and the involvement of the multistrata throng of country people in the building of the new life. This was surely the most difficult question of the revolution after the gaining of political power. Lenin saw cooperativization as the only key to the fruitful solution of it. But how can you more accurately understand, interpret and implement this idea when it is so overlaid with social romanticism and even frankly banal daydreaming and how do you develop the cooperative principle under conditions of unadorned reality in such a way that everyone sees clearly its socialist significance? Vladimir Il'ich devotes one of his last works specially to these speculations.

After the October Revolution. Five whole years of multifaceted socialist experiments in the countryside, painstaking cultivation of shoots and grains and manifestations of the new passed by before the cooperative plan finally took shape. From the birth of the first communes and associations for the joint cultivation of land, Vladimir Il'ich did not tire in his concern to secure their consolidation in life, to strive to win recognition and legitimization for them, and on their experience to bring the peasant masses to an understanding of the only true path--the social cultivation of the land. And throughout those 5 years, Vladimir Il'ich tirelessly defended the interests of commissars, in his personal correspondence with cooperative workers, in party discussions and in businesslike talks, Lenin was able carefully and confidently to reveal all the advantages and potential strengths of cooperativization and channel them in the direction of socialist creation. Lenin's monologue on cooperativization recorded by his stenographer in the early days of January 1923 effectively generalizes the entire experience of its development and the creation of the Soviet peasantry's first collective farms. The cooperative plan for the socialist restructuring of life is also developed from a synthesis of it.

Vladimir Il'ich polemically locates his idea, his "new principle of the organization of the population"--cooperativization--within the complex system of socioeconomic relations of the New Economic Policy period. He examines one contingency, then a second and a third and reaches the conclusion that "...the system of civilized cooperative workers under the social ownership of the means of production and the class victory of the proletariat over the bourgeoisie--that is the system of socialism" (op. cit., vol 45, p 373).

While firmly raising the question of the need to bring about the "participation of the entire population in cooperativization," Vladimir Il'ich is striving for the "transition to the new system by the simplest, easiest and most accessible means possible for the peasantry" (ibid., p 370). And he warns against haste. Repeatedly he dinned into lovers of catchy slogans and predictions: "It would be better instead to take just one district and to show by a businesslike analysis how 'cooperativization' is to be assisted rather than to anger the peasantry by a silly communistic playing around at cooperativization..." (ibid., p 45). Vladimir Il'ich constantly warned against absurd attempts to force the pace of the social cultivation of the land or to introduce it by decrees or laws and warned "not to outpace the development of the masses under any circumstances but to wait until progress develops from those masses' own experience and own struggle" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," vol 37, p 141).

Hence Lenin's strict instruction and the party's immutable principle in the building of the new countryside: no compulsion! He also raises the question of giving property advantages and considerable material assistance to cooperatives. "...Cooperatives should be given a number of economic, financial and banking privileges: that is the form that our socialist state's support for the new principle of the organization of the population should take" (op. cit., vol 45, p 373). Vladimir Il'ich clarifies the concept of support. "...That support should imply a support for the kind of cooperative exchange in which the real masses of the population really do participate" (ibid., p 371). In welcoming various forms of incentive in cooperative work he advised that "conscientiousness" and "high quality" should be taken into account and that "a form of bonuses" should also be chosen "whereby we achieve a civilized cooperative worker" (ibid., p 373).

Our second task, Vladimir Il'ich thought when considering the cooperative plan, consists in cultural work for the peasantry. A complete cooperative system, he stresses, "is impossible without a complete cultural revolution" which would embrace an era of history.

"We can complete that era, at best, in 10 to 20 years," Vladimir Il'ich said, looking into the near future. "Nevertheless, it will be a special historical era and without that historical era, without universal literacy, without a sufficient degree of reasoning ability, without sufficiently accustoming the population to make use of books and without the material basis....without that we cannot reach our goal" (ibid., p 372).

Vladimir Il'ich directs this second and indispensable part of the program for the renewal of the countryside, incidentally, at those pedantic opponents of the Russian October Revolution who speak unceasingly of the foolishness of "implanting socialism in an insufficiently cultured country." An all-embracing cultural revolution launched on a known material basis completes quite successfully the civilizing preparation for socialist conditions.

Here in the final works, as is always the case with Vladimir Il'ich, major creative studies and scientific preconditions subsist alongside a practical analysis of the present moment and concrete businesslike guidelines. It was in those January days that the "Pages From a Diary" were dictated which were published under the same heading in PRAVDA. That work could also have been called: "How Are We To Develop a Genuinely Cultured Revolution?" It was that question which concerned Vladimir Il'ich when analyzing the data of the census "Literacy in Russia." Lenin provides those who like to chatter about proletarian culture with substantial facts--progress in education, it seems, is still too slow. "This is a grim warning and reproach to those who have had and still have unrealistic notions of 'proletarian culture.' That shows how much urgent preparatory work we still have to do..." (op. cit., vol 45, p 364).

Vladimir Il'ich saw the need to steer the state budget perceptibly toward satisfying the needs of education. Of course, the state budget is no bottomless well. But in the "proletarian-peasant state there are still very many economies that can and must be made for the development of popular literacy

by closing down all those semi-aristocratic trifles and institutions which we still do not need and which we can and must do without for a long time yet..." (ibid., p 365). There must be no skimping when it is a question of creating normal conditions for teachers. We must win the teachers over and make them the reliable bulwark of Soviet power.

Reading through the shorthand version, Vladimir Il'ich decided to make several additions. His thoughts on the utilization of the most diverse forms of patronage and on satisfying the countryside's cultural needs also form the concluding part of the article.

Answering his own question of how to approach socialism, Vladimir Il'ich could not fail to bring to the fore the re-creation of the state apparatus to which he assigned an exceptionally important role in the building of the Soviet state itself. There was no time to think out, verify, feel deeply, or consolidate the good things that had emerged in the social system. Nor could it be any other way, of course, at a time of revolutionary breakthrough and "given the breakneck speed of development which took us in 5 years from tsarism to the Soviet system" (ibid., p 390). But it is important not to waste time, either.

Yes, the state apparatus is the main concern. That was the subject of the most vigorous of theses of Lenin's report at the 11th Party Congress. Those troubled thoughts provided the raw material for all the businesslike letters of the latter period. Nor could he ignore it in his last public speech. Before finally becoming bedridden in December, he outlined the abstract of a speech in which he intended to say with the utmost bluntness at the congress of Soviets that the state apparatus as a whole was thoroughly rotten... Addressing a session of the All-Russian Central Executive Committee, he told deputies plainly: Our apparatus suffers from very many shortcomings, is more than twice as large as it should be and very often works not for us but against us. It was all such a rush after the revolution, trusts were hastily heaped upon main committees, people's commissariats were heaped upon offices and everything spontaneously became inflated to the point of being unmanageable....

That was when the question of quality was keenly raised. From what had gone before, the prime conclusion was that it would be better to slow down. Rushing, haste, briskness and energy have no place here. The renewal of the state machinery is a matter of an entire culture and getting to grips with it takes years.

The hastily created state apparatus suffered from the senile short-windedness of the previous officials. After Lenin's articles, the 12th Party Congress was to stress that with great straightforwardness: "We want a state apparatus as a means of serving the popular masses but parts of that state apparatus want to turn them into a means of sustaining it." It is necessary to free and purge oneself of that parasitical attitude, sham activity, creeping bureaucracy, and many other malignant excrescences as soon as possible.

First, Lenin thought, it is necessary to create a prototype of a socialist institution which could be used "as an instrument for improving our apparatus." The Rabkrin was to be that prototype, that instrument. Vladimir Il'ich gave much thought to the "model" of that specifically Soviet people's commissariat and before beginning his final work set out his proposals on the Rabkrin's reorganization to the 12th Party Congress.

Lenin's thoughts on the Rabkrin--that laboratory of Soviet administration--amounted to two complete versions of the same article. The heading of the first article asked: "What Should We Do With the Rabkrin?" Lenin showed that it had to be reformed, reorganized. But the article that was published was to have a different title: "How We Should Reorganize the Rabkrin." How indeed? Let us combine the workers' and peasants' control with the party control, the Rabkrin with the Central Control Commission and give Central Control Commission members the same status as higher party representatives. Let us relieve the Rabkrin of excess staff and give it great prestige....

In organizing the model institution, Vladimir Il'ich's advice is to rely on the recommendations of science but on condition that those recommendations are actually "at the peak of modern science" and that they guarantee to "provide full backup." It would be useful, in his opinion, to announce a competition to produce manuals on labor organization in general and administrative work in particular and to create a competitive program for those seeking posts themselves. He advised that able and conscientious people be sent abroad to study the question there. To study it, not to copy it. Vladimir Il'ich repeatedly stresses the idea that in building a new administrative apparatus we must put forward not those demands that the contemporary bourgeois state puts forward but "those that it is fit and proper to make of a country that has set itself the task of developing into a socialist country" (op. cit., vol 45, p 391).

"The new model institution must have dependable people," Vladimir Il'ich stresses. What qualities must those people have? Above all they must be reliable in the party sense. Second, they must be well-educated people who understand the essence of matters and are skilled in the means and methods of administration, people who can be relied upon not to take anything purely on trust, who will not say anything contrary to their conscience, who would not be afraid to admit to any difficulty and would not back down from any struggle to attain a major goal. A truly rock-like character is needed here. And it will be necessary to show a demonic persistence, especially since the work in the early stages, at least, will be diabolically thankless. Such people must be able to undergo all this without fear or despondency.

It would be good not only to recruit people with solid references each time but also those who can take examinations in their stride. Let prospective employees be tested in their knowledge of the fundamentals of the science of administration, business and so forth. In addition to all that, it is important that they have the ability to work smoothly and do not debase everything by their ambition and lack of understanding. It is clear that this requires a high degree of culture and refinement.

Are these conditions not excessive? It may be said behind your back that "practical workers" will scorn them. But it is a case of either-or. Either we are really creating something new in the system of administration or we remain bound by the prejudices of officials and the musty atmosphere of creeping bureaucracy.

Once, twice, three times, Vladimir Il'ich leads his unseen interlocutors along new strands of ideas while carefully outlining which elements are to be used to form that most complex remedial instrument of the party and the working people. And each time he comes to the same idea: that the quality of workers and their work is all-decisive. He proposes that strict guidance be taken from the golden rule: "Quality, not quantity."

Thoughts on the Gosplan also arise within the system of speculation on the need for change. State affairs are becoming unusually complex. A constructive approach is required quite often in addition to expertise.

Like it or not science must sit down with administration. Moves should be made toward increasing Gosplan's competence. But attributing legislative functions to Gosplan does not mean giving it an administrator's whip. Its administrative force should essentially be subsidiary. Success is determined by the level of erudition plus independence plus conscientiousness. "The leader of a state institution should be supremely capable of winning people over and should possess a sufficient degree of solid scientific and technical knowledge to check on their work. That is the main thing" (op. cit., vol 45, p 351).

Vladimir Il'ich had to abandon the almost finished synopsis of his speech to the delegates of the 10th Congress of Russian Soviets and there was no question of attending the unifying congress....

While he was confined to bed and dictating: "I seem to be very much to blame as far as the Russian workers are concerned for failing to intervene vigorously and incisively enough in the notorious autonomization question..."--at that time literally a thousand paces from his Kremlin apartment, the applauding congress was thundering in every tier of the Bolshoy Theater. Fundamental documents were being adopted--the Declaration, the Treaty--and the Union Central Executive Committee was being elected. The proud lietmotif of the speeches resounded: we are laying the first stone, we are standing at the source.

...No, the source came earlier. It can be seen in the first dawns of bolshevism when the party's main objectives and tasks were being formed; in those far-off days when the Bolsheviks' national program was undergoing ordeals by fire in the fighting in Baku and at the Krasnaya Presnya barricades; in that historical period when the nations' complete equality and the cohesion and principled positions of the proletariat on the nationalities questions were being defended on the stage of the political life of a Europe shrouded in the rank fog of chauvinism, in a keen, critical struggle--even then the foundations of the great union of republics were being determined.

With the October victory the building of the union became a practical matter. Some 2.5 months after the revolution, at the Third All-Russian Congress of Soviets which validated "the declaration of the rights of the working and exploited people," Vladimir Il'ich was able with complete justification to utter words which were to become an inspiration: "We rule, not by dividing, as under the stern law of Ancient Rome, but by uniting all working people with the unbreakable chains of vital interests and class consciousness" (op. cit., vol 35, p 287).

Vladimir Il'ich cherishes the socialist union of nations born of the revolution like a favorite child. He watches unremittingly to see whether it is firmly finding its feet, growing confidently, or whether anything is impeding its development.... He always finds inspired words to support a good undertaking and firmness to call the incautious to display circumspection, tact to correct the overenthusiastic and severity to cool the overhasty....

On the path to the creation of the unified union there arose the notorious idea of "autonomization." Scarcely recovered from his illness, Vladimir Il'ich specially invited members of the commission for preparing the congress and representatives of the republics to ascertain all their viewpoints. He had a particularly long argument then with Stalin, proving to him that it was necessary not to destroy independence but to create "another new tier, a federation of equal republics." First he persuaded Stalin to abandon the thesis "of the entry of independent republics into the RSFSR." Then he persuaded him of the need to form a Union Central Executive Committee. Ultimately Stalin fundamentally reworked the working commission's resolution and sustained the correct tone in preparing for the congress.

Why, you may ask, was it only 5 years later, and not immediately after the revolution, that the very important act in the building of the Soviet state, which the union's creation represented, was accomplished? Why could the union not have been "proclaimed," "decreed" or "instituted" before? The point was precisely that it could not be decreed. To understand the bolshevist truth here we must come to an understanding of "a truly proletarian attitude toward the nationalities question." "What is important for the proletarian?" Vladimir Il'ich ponders, dictating his letter. "It is fundamentally important for him to secure through his profoundly sincere attitude the maximum trust of the non-Russians in the class struggle--those same non-Russians who over the centuries have formed grudges, distrust and suspicion toward the great-power nation. It was necessary for millions of people to feel for themselves, to see the material, political, and moral preconditions for truly fraternal communal living.

But what makes us speak of this with new anxiety is the fear that we may lull ourselves with well-intentioned declarations. The nationalities question, always so delicate and keenly perceived, cannot be regarded in the abstract, without feeling or understanding the inequality which actually takes shape in life. The communist and internationalist must have a fine sense to know where it is better to err on the side of softness and leniency and where it is better to err on the side of caution.... Again and again Lenin demands from the communists and all aware workers that they "never treat the nationalities question merely formally."

One question which prevented Vladimir Il'ich from going to sleep that December evening until he had gotten permission from the doctor on duty to dictate his 4-minute letter was the question of the need for certain political changes which persistently faced him throughout the days of his winter meditations. It was the question of the party's destiny, its strength and unity, the inextricability of its ties with the masses. It was the question of the authority of the Central Committee and its collective wisdom, steadfastness and ability to work.

"I want to share with you," Lenin says, addressing the party congress delegates, "the considerations I regard as the most important. I put first the increase in the number of Central Committee members..... I think that this is something necessary for the enhancement of the Central Committee's prestige, for serious work to improve our apparatus, and to prevent the conflicts between small sections of the Central Committee from acquiring disproportionate importance for the entire destiny of the party.... I think that our party's stability would, thanks to this measure, gain a thousand times over" (op. cit., vol 45, pp 343-344).

Concern for "stability" is of supreme importance. Which of our enemies does not count on splitting and introducing serious differences into the party? And there are many sorry lessons to be found in history. Of course, there are no eternal guarantees here. But they are essential for the immediate, particular period. Vladimir Il'ich suggests also examining a number of considerations of a purely personal nature. Describing the most outstanding leaders, he is far from thinking of placing them on any hierarchical ladders. He merely wants, with extreme democracy and party frankness, to draw attention to their strong and weak sides, attaching importance even to details. There you are, comrades, he says, look: so-and-so has such-and-such abilities, but this and that must be borne in mind with regard to him--weigh this up when you decide....

Vladimir Il'ich was very concerned for the authority of the communist, particularly the leader. Of course, this is a special authority, but it is never created by titles or decrees, but is formed of its own accord by the natural process of life. Lenin was always impressed by the ideal of the leader and comrade before whose superiority you bow down in the knowledge that he will always understand and, in turn, wants to be understood.

At the 11th Party Congress Vladimir Il'ich initiated a particularly keen discussion of the merits of the leaders and the conceit even of comrades know to be devoted and honest.... You see, we have before us a fighter in the world's greatest revolution, and he is being looked at if not by 40 pyramids then by 40 European countries hoping for salvation, and he is being compelled to learn from an ordinary salesman. And he is unable to grasp mentally or comprehend emotionally that the times have long passed when it was enough to develop a great program and call on the people to fulfill it. Now it is necessary to prove that you personally are capable of acquiring, trading and building--in brief, that you are capable of rendering practical assistance to the worker and peasant in undertaking economic management. And it was stated, without beating about the bush: if you are a responsible communist, if you understand life's demand correctly, you will achieve your objective....

The openness and purifying boldness which is displayed confidently by a strong organization and the party as a whole sometimes does not come easily to the individual. Restraining circumstances, an awkwardness complex and a sense of self-preservation arise. We must overcome this phony sense of awkwardness and grievance, Vladimir Il'ich argued; it is our duty to the party and the working class. This frankness provided "the necessary material for the party's self-education," he stressed, and enables the masses to recognize influential workers and "place each of them on the appropriate shelf."

In his letters to the congress Vladimir Il'ich advises that new cadres be drawn from among the workers and peasants. Here there should be no shutting oneself up inside the circle of those who have already had a long period of Soviet service--certain traditions and certain prejudices which it is specifically desirable to combat weigh them down. Far more valuable are candidates from the ranks of ordinary workers and peasants. If they are skillfully trained, they can make cadres of devoted supporters of the Soviet system....

In general, as Vladimir Il'ich had already had occasion to say in his last speech, we are seeking to ensure that our work can be seen by the people. We must ensure that everything is verified, that all the masses and the entire population verify our path. We will seek to rebuild everything in a socialist way and to create living conditions such that the majority of working people say to us: "You do not praise yourselves, but we praise you, we say that you have achieved the best results, after which not a single sensible person will ever think of returning to the old system" (op. cit., vol 45, p 308).

In the last days of his creative work, Vladimir Lenin again and again, with anxiety and hope, takes a sweeping look at the earth, peers at the altered face of the post-October world. Against this historical background the qualitative tasks of socialist transformation appear in close-up....

Capital's aim has been thwarted. On over one-sixth of the planet the chain of imperialism has been broken and power is in the working people's hands. However, the socialist cliff is so far alone. The beacon of the soviets lights the way for the world proletariat, but around it the ring of darkness, the forces of imperialism, are closing in. The bourgeoisie is maneuvering, undertaking actions neutralizing the influence of October, making a number of trivial concessions to the oppressed masses, and creating some semblance of "social peace." But there are no neutralizing concessions with which capital can avert the threat of world crisis or the awakening of new revolutionary forces.

Will Russia succeed in holding out with its small-scale commodity production until the main capitalist countries complete their development toward socialism? But they are not completing it as was formerly expected, not through the even "maturation" of socialism in them but through some states' exploitation of others, combined with exploitation of the entire East. The East, for its part, has definitively been drawn into the general processes of the world revolutionary movement....

That the entire world is coming to this movement is to our advantage.

That imperialism has succeeded in splitting the world into two camps is to our disadvantage.

The threat of a clash is growing.

How is the question ultimately resolved? "...The solution depends here on too many circumstances, and the outcome of the struggle in general and as a whole can only be predicted on the basis of the premise that the gigantic majority of the world's population ultimately is trained and educated for the struggle by capitalism itself. The outcome of the struggle depends ultimately on the fact that Russia, India, China and so forth comprise the gigantic majority of the population majority which has been drawn with unwonted rapidity in recent years into the struggle for its liberation, so that in that sense there cannot be a shadow of doubt as to what the final solution of the world struggle will be. In that sense the definitive victory of socialism is completely and unconditionally assured" (op. cit., vol 45, p 404).

Every word of Lenin's last works has the ring of a most sacred behest, and each of these words is addressed to all socialist generations: together we have turned the terrible old world around, now it must be built anew. Doing this painstakingly and well depends on your hands and minds. Doing it in such a way that one and all can see that socialism contains gigantic forces, that mankind has moved to a new stage of development harboring brilliant opportunities....

That is how Lenin linked in his thoughts the overall plan for our work, our policy and our tactics.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1983

CSO: 1802/12

THE LENINIST ETHICS OF BOLSHEVISM

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 6, Apr 83 pp 58-67

[Text] For all the working people bolshevism, whose 80th anniversary we are celebrating this year, has become a symbol of the unbending will of the working class to accomplish honestly and fully its worldwide, historic liberating mission, namely, to relieve the working people of exploitation and oppression and to implement the truly humanitarian communist ideals. As a trend of political thought and as a political party of the proletariat, bolshevism has won respect for its strictly scientific theoretical consistency, courageous struggle, and high moral authority. In bolshevism politics and morality are conditioned on each other and merged into one.

Under the guidance of V. I. Lenin the Bolshevik Party elaborated its own clearly defined style of action of intraparty relations and party relations with the masses, and a clear concept of its political and moral responsibility to the working people of our country and to the international working class as well as of the moral makeup of a party member. This combination of related principles and norms can without exaggeration be characterized as the Leninist ethics of bolshevism, keeping in mind that it logically follows from the Marxist-Leninist doctrine and therefore reflects and develops the best features and aspirations of the working class.

A number of factors are in natural manner combined in this ethic, complementing each other: the requirements for a high state of organization and discipline, for collectivity and equal party responsibility, for democracy and centralism, for a creative approach to the cause for initiative as well as for the party member to strive to set always and everywhere an example for others and to align his deeds with the norms of communist morality. A communist and bolshevik cannot in any way justify a retreat from these norms. To be in the ranks of the Leninist party means to volunteer both for the most difficult work and for the greatest responsibility and to be a real political fighter and a leader in all that is new, to be irreconcilable vis-a-vis conservative and demagogic workers. The CPSU Central Committee resolution "On the 80th Anniversary of the Second RSDRP [Russian Social Democratic Workers Party] Congress" states: "It is the CPSU's concern to have every communist become a selfless fighter for the triumph of its great ideals, deeply knowing, understanding, and implementing the ideas of Marxism-Leninism and the party policy. Belonging to the party does not bring any privileges, but rather signifies that the communists bear a higher degree of responsibility for everything that goes on in our country and for the future of socialist construction and social progress."

The communists are always in the public eye of nonparty members both in the labor collectives and in everyday life; they are more closely observed, their opinions listened to and their deeds judged more partially. This is natural since every CPSU member, in his microsocial sphere, acts as a plenipotentiary representative of the leading force of our socialist society and, to a great extent, people judge the party as a whole by the conduct of the communists who, just as himself, work and live side by side with them. An immediate duty of every communist--if he really values this title and is aware of the full measure of his responsibility for the CPSU authority and for the firm cohesion of the party and the people--is not to sacrifice under any circumstances his bolshevik principles and not to exceed the limits of bolshevik ethics.

It seems that Lenin has not devoted any special works to ethics, except for his speech at the Third Komsomol Congress. However, this is precisely the point: Acting from the very beginning as a consistent Marxist and brilliant follower of the cause of K. Marx and F. Engels--the great leaders and teachers of the world proletariat--the founder of bolshevism always uncovered both the socioclass and ethical purport of Marxist principles. Let us recall how, speaking to the Third Komsomol Congress, he emphasized: "We say that our morality is fully subordinated to the interests of the class struggle of the proletariat. Our morality derives from the interests of the class struggle of the proletariat" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 41, p 309). He further says: "Morality serves to help human society rise higher and rid itself of the exploitation of labor" (*ibid.*, p 313). This short explanation contains a very deep understanding of the moral greatness of Marxism.

Having discovered and substantiated the laws of social development and the material foundation for mankind's advance along the path of progress--public production--and having proved that social awareness in general and its every form in particular depend on the social situation, Marxism developed the materialistic understanding of history. Apart from everything else, one of its great achievements was the fact that it discovered the earthbound roots of morality as a form of social awareness. Having thus deprived morality of the right to be proud of its allegedly divine nature or, in the worst case, to present itself as something mysteriously born of the individual mystical "I," densely shrouded by subjectively idealistic philosophical fog, Marxism in no way detracted from its dignity. On the contrary, it cleared the way for morality to become really eminent, thus making it possible to transform it from a fairly ineffective means of containing the egotistic strivings of the individualistically disposed personality to an effective instrument of the revolutionary transformation of public life.

The materialist understanding of history crowned by the doctrine of creating a society imbued with social justice, established a connection between the high moral ideals and the material prerequisites for their implementation. For a communist every social change also has its moral meaning and every moral phenomenon is viewed first of all from the perspective of whether it is useful for the cause of the struggle for communism. In evaluating the moral phenomena the criterion of revolutionary practice always plays the leading

role, completely in accordance with the requirements of the dialectical-materialist approach to the surrounding reality, both natural and social.

While elaborating the new world outlook, Marx and Engels arrived at the truth, which is now indisputable for us, that the production and economic relations between the people also determine, in the final analysis, all other social relations, including moral ones. This is why, while relations of private ownership inevitably lead to the exploitation of one individual by another and transform labor from a process of self-affirmation of the personality into a process of its self-alienation, they consequently morally disfigure the individual and in the end distort the moral consciousness of society and the social function of morality.

Indeed, in the world of capital, where relations between people take the form of relations between things and where things become the measure of individuals, instead of the individual being the measure of things--in this world the individual himself is viewed only as an instrument of achieving goals which are alien to him, and morality cannot genuinely regulate human relations. Its essence and purpose are turned inside out. Here it plays against its own will the not so respectable role of an adviser whose help is sought in a hypocritical fashion so that afterward his naivete can be ridiculed to one's heart's content. The bourgeois mind simply refuses to recognize the "civil rights" of morality in either the economic or political spheres.

In these spheres of public life lies, deceit, perfidy, tyranny, and hypocrisy are accepted as normal and, if they are condemned to a certain degree, then only hypocritically.

In their "Communist Party Manifesto" Marx and Engels demonstrated that communists do not invent any special ethics; they want to establish the simple norms of morality in public life, norms which are designed to defend both the interests of the individual and the interests of society as a whole. What is new in their formulation of morality is their nonformalistic, concrete historical and class-determined interpretation of its norms and also the fact that they point out the ways and means of transforming it into an effective force of social progress. Marxism-Leninism teaches us that to achieve this it is necessary first of all to do away with the initial cause of all social evils--the private ownership of the means of production, which is a material and economic manifestation of alienated labor--thus also abolishing moral alienation, and to transform the individual from an instrument into an aim in itself and the highest value. The free and comprehensive development of the personality must be made not only a moral but also a social ideal.

As is known, abolishing private ownership is the task of the socialist (according to Marx and Engels--communist) revolution. Marx wrote: "To do away with the idea of private ownership is quite sufficient for the idea of communism. To do away with the private ownership in reality, real communist action is required" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch." [Works], vol 42, p 136). In the bolshevik ethics the principle of real communist action became the chief and determining one. Occasionally, strongly divergent moral positions became apparent in the revolutionary workers' movement, including some in direct contradiction with the above principle.

Thus, the mensheviks attempted to transform the party into a discussion club, denying that it was necessary and obligatory for every member to work actively for the revolution. However, Lenin and the bolsheviks never deviated from this principle. It is not accidental that even after the October victory, while advising the young people in 1920 on the construction of socialism, Lenin emphasized: "Educating communist youth does not consist of offering them various kinds of sweet talk on the rules of morality.... At the basis of communist morality lies the struggle to consolidate and complete communism" ("Poln. Sобр. Soch.," vol 41, p 313).

For Lenin and the bolsheviks, the founders of scientific communism, Marx and Engels themselves served as an example of highly ethical behavior and attitude to life. Their personalities, which embraced all the best human qualities of true collectivists and staunch fighters for social justice and the happiness of the working people, present a worthy example of moral perfection. Lenin also regarded the attitude to life of a number of outstanding Russian revolutionaries of the previous generation as an example for himself and others; he admired their heroism and self-denial in the struggle for a better future for the working people. The Leninist ethics of bolshevism have imbibed all the best traditions of the past, having reinterpreted them accordingly, of course.

Every serious task requires the individual to strain to a certain extent his physical and intellectual resources, knowledge, and skill. This is well-known. However, to accomplish the task well and with a maximum of benefit for the people and to complete that which has been started also requires substantial moral efforts, namely, willpower, self-control, and moral staunchness. These are the indispensable conditions of success. However, these qualities are not given to people at birth as unconditioned reflexes, so to speak. They are acquired through training and self-education and it is best to acquire them quite consciously and with a clearly discernible aim.

Purposefulness and the state of constant readiness to work for the sake of public benefit is one of the main features of the Leninist ethics of bolshevism. It requires maximum selflessness with regard to the chosen profession, conscious self-discipline, and a high state of organization. Its indispensable attribute, if not prerequisite, is to have communist convictions and deep understanding of the social purport of one's activity.

It was precisely this purposefulness which helped Lenin and the bolsheviks successfully carry out their struggle to establish proletarian class self-awareness, propagate Marxism in Russia, and create a new type of party, capable of overcoming the difficulties, at times inconceivable, on the path leading to the victory of the socialist revolution and during the construction of a new society, a party which never allowed the numerous opportunists, both at home and abroad, to divert it from the correct path.

Even in his early years, Lenin, having made up his mind to engage in revolutionary work, pursued this goal with admirable consistency. He most often worked earnestly at improving himself: he educated himself in the broadest sense of the word, thoroughly studied the works of Marx and Engels, intently

observed the surrounding reality, persistently trained himself in the qualities necessary for a professional revolutionary, manifesting great persistence and staunchness, and formed steel-like willpower.

Lenin's purposefulness served as a magnificent example for his friends and infuriated his enemies. The menshevik Dan, a well-known opponent of bolshevism, who spent all his life fighting Lenin, once said with ill-concealed hatred that "there is no other person who devotes 24 hours a day to the revolution, who has no thoughts apart from the thought of the revolution, and who even dreams of the revolution at night. Try to cope with him." To a certain extent purposefulness always requires self-denial, be it only self-restraint, and it is as if it multiplies the strength of the individual and elevates him morally. In the words of M. I. Ulyanova, Lenin's slogan was, as he himself once said: To hasten to live in order to give all one's strength to the revolution.

How often do we lack, unfortunately, this very purposefulness or, as in the case of certain people, is it far from directed toward the common good. It is primarily because of this that, although we discuss mistakes, faults, and shortcomings at such great length and so impartially, they repeat themselves again and again and sometimes on a large scale, as if they occurred spontaneously, as if it were not ourselves who make them and someone else could eliminate them. Yet if every Soviet man, whatever major or minor task is entrusted to him, performed it in a truly Leninist manner, thoughtfully and responsibly, with full selflessness and genuine concern for solving the tasks facing our society, how many negative phenomena would we have rid ourselves of long ago!

It is appropriate at this point to cite a statement made by Lenin during the time of the struggle against "otzovism," referring to those bolsheviks who had recognized, not instantaneously but fairly soon, how stupid and wretched this phenomenon was: "They did not repeat the phrases learned by heart, but attentively observed the new historical conditions, pondered why life continued the way it did and not any other way, used their heads and not only their mouths, and carried out serious and consistent proletarian work...." (op. cit., vol 19, p 107). This statement by Lenin directly concerns morality because learning ready-made formulas by heart, being incapable of or unwilling to comprehend life's changing demands, and talking too much on the subject of communism, have always stood in reverse proportion to real communist action and have seriously hindered the people from purposefully and fruitfully working for the future and performing their social duty as it should be performed in the Leninist way.

When people "use their heads and not only their mouths" it is not particularly difficult to arrive at the simple truth that if any type of socially useful labor is approached without proprietary interest--uncreatively, without enthusiasm, so to speak, without putting one's soul into the final results of one's labor, which merges with the labor of the collective and all the people--then we suffer not only economic but also moral damage. The latter type of damage can be more dangerous and perceptible, although it cannot be measured either in rubles or tons. Adding to it and accumulating it

deforms to a certain extent the socialist public and individual consciousness, opposes the objectively required tendency, which is making its way into our society, of transforming work into the first vital requirement of the individual, and in the end results in quite tangible economic losses and the deformation of collectivist social relations.

The Soviet people have scored great successes in perfecting the developed socialist society which they have built. However, we have still failed to rid ourselves of such negative phenomena as bad management; lack of discipline, responsibility, and initiative; fear of that which is new; various manifestations of bureaucracy; and so forth. Party documents have repeatedly emphasized that the struggle against these phenomena, antisocialist in nature, cannot be viewed other than as a matter of common concern.

In his speech to the November 1982 CPSU Central Committee Plenum, Yu. V. Andropov, the CPSU Central Committee general secretary, once again devoted his attention to the serious shortcomings in developing the people's economy, which are connected precisely with the negligent attitude of people to their duties. He noted the lack of initiative and resolve in the struggle against bad management and wastefulness. He emphasized: "Of course, it is only possible to solve this task with the participation of every worker and every working individual at our enterprises, kolkhozes, and sovkhozes. We must make them consider this task as their very own."

Displaying indifference and lack of exactingness with regard to themselves and others, people gradually stop viewing this as a moral and social evil and become accustomed to the soothing thought that it is not reprehensible to behave in this way. They stop becoming indignant when they see public property squandered or plundered and state plans unfulfilled. Cases of eye-washing, all kinds of fiddling, and receiving illegal bonuses do not seem so very unacceptable any longer.

This is how the relapses of petty bourgeois and narrow-minded psychology occur, psychology which, as they say, smells of individualism from a mile away. This is the psychology which always succeeds in finding loopholes to justify unjust, harmful actions, from the public point of view, on the party of those individuals who violate the socialist principle of labor-linked distribution, procure offices for their friends and "useful people," utilize their official status for mercenary motives, and infringe upon the interests of really honest workers. This is the psychology of moneygrubbing and callousness, which are always interrelated but are, as a rule, carefully concealed from the public eye.

The vast majority of Soviet people are actively in favor of rejecting such views and consider it obligatory to follow the principles of communist morality in their attitude to life, their behavior, and foremost in the way they fulfill their public duty. However, even many of those who do not accept the moral principles of petit bourgeois psychology are far from being active fighters for the triumph of the principles of communist morality on a wide public scale. Most probably they also lack determination, this very determination to which bolshevism owes its historic victories.

We know quite well how resolutely Lenin and his supporters fought to create a militant political organization of the proletariat which was not daunted by

its historic responsibility for the fate of the country, and how courageously and confidently the Bolsheviks organized the defense of the gains of the October Revolution and how they were the first in the world to start building the new society. We know quite well how much the Soviet people have achieved on the unpaved road of creating a communist civilization under the leadership of the Leninist party. Yet resolve is not only required under the extreme condition of the open struggle against the class enemy, under the conditions of revolution, the change of the social system, or the defense of the fatherland from external enemies. It is also needed under the conditions of the peaceful, onward movement of the new society and in the course of the regular flow of everyday working life as well as in major and minor tasks.

It is well-known how strictly Lenin made the workers, particularly those in leading positions, responsible for not fulfilling this or that directive, for displaying a thoughtless or simply careless attitude to their duties, and so forth. When it did happen that through this they had caused some serious damage, he demanded that they be punished severely and immediately. Many of Lenin's working notes and resolutions to this effect have reached us and, while we acquaint ourselves with them, we should not think that the alleged irreconcilability and resolve of the chairman of the Council of People's Commissars was dictated by circumstances which did not leave him any other way out then, whereas nowadays the activity of officials and all workers need not be controlled so strictly.

Probably this is what people often think. As a result the struggle to implement strictly the decisions of the party and government, Soviet laws and other normative acts regulating the public, and primarily production relations and the struggle for discipline and order, and for all citizens to observe the rules of socialist communal life, is sometimes not carried out resolutely enough. Practice attests unambiguously that it is still too early to rely exclusively or chiefly on the moral responsibility of the people. It is also necessary to remind people more often, whenever public interests demand, of the legal, administrative, and even criminal responsibility.

Yu. V. Andropov said: "It is necessary to enhance the responsibility for observing the all-state and all-people interests and to eliminate resolutely departmentalism and parochialism. It must be made a rule that every new decision on the same question is only taken when the previous decisions have been carried out or some new circumstances have arisen. It is necessary to conduct more resolutely the struggle against all violations of the party, state, and labor discipline." As for these violations, they are quite varied and occur not quite so rarely, thus rendering an extremely poor service to strengthening the principles and norms of the communist morality in our society.

It is not clear that the failures entailing no particular consequences for those responsible to fulfill the state plan generate, frankly speaking, a disrespect on the part of the people for the laws and decisions of state importance in general. The plan is adopted in the form of a law and is based on the decisions of the congresses and plenums of the communist party. It is also possible to interpret, for instance, the insufficient application of the resolution of the CPSU Central Committee and the USSR Council of Ministers of 23 February 1970 on struggling against the individuals pursuing a parasitical

way of life, a phenomenon which is, without exaggeration, the most antisocialist phenomenon in our society. As a result, an almost indulgent attitude toward the people who openly refuse to participate in the socially useful labor has spread. Many varieties of idlers have become visible figures in both cities and villages. This is happening at a time when there is a marked shortage of labor resources to fulfill our grandiose socioeconomic plans.

How many economic, social and moral problems are connected with idlers on the whole: fluctuation of manpower, speculations, theft, plunder of socialist property, knocking off work [shabashnichestvo], and providing a corruptive influence on honest workers. Instead of making them work, they are fussed over and "educated." Many people respond to breakdowns in the work of the organs which manage the people's economy and guard law and order by indifference to public order or even by becoming convinced that to break the order does not signify doing something immoral.

If people know that it is possible to get away with a party and administrative penalty, without losing their leading position, after having wasted a great amount of human labor and, in fact, thrown the people's money to the wind and having covered all this up by citing "uncompleted capital construction," and for letting the uninstalled equipment rust and morally age in warehouses and at construction sites, then it is difficult to expect them to resolutely suppress the minor immoral acts occurring in their immediate surroundings. Individuals who waste the people's property and thoughtlessly destroy nature, and the bureaucrats who distort the essence of socialist democracy and are not punished as they deserve, undermine, whether they want this or not, the foundations of communist morality in our society and infect those who are unstable with a lack of trust in it. It is true that morality has earthly roots, and it is very bad when they absorb from the midst of the public life not only the lifegiving sap of the genuinely collectivist human behavior, but also the acids which poison the moral awareness of the Soviet people.

We must be aware of this still painful process of struggle between that which is old and that which is new in order to evaluate in the bolshevist direct and principled manner all the strong and weak points of our moral atmosphere, without relying on all-powerful time which will, allegedly, grind everything down. We must make our evaluations without looking back and without superficiality, while honestly searching the antipodes of communist morality. The latter are justly called the surviving vestiges of capitalism, in the sense that they are foreign to socialist awareness. However, the use of the term "surviving vestiges" in order to explain why these antipodes still exist and how they are reproduced, in fact exclusively ascribes to them the ideological influence of the past or hostile actions from abroad. This approach can hardly reveal the full truth, due to its apparent violation of the requirements made by the dialectical-materialistic method of cognizing and explaining the phenomena of social reality. Indeed our contemporary public awareness is thereby separated from our contemporary public existence.

Principled attitudes in everything--be it in theoretically comprehending public life, struggling against bourgeois ideology, leading economic and cultural construction, or the activity of social institutes, the relations between leaders and their subordinates, or personal relations between

people--are also an integral feature of bolshevist ethics. Principled attitudes as a result of being honest, competent, and possessing scientific knowledge, that is, of being convinced with the reason of one's being right nurture civil courage, stand guard over justice, and help the people form an active position regarding life and a sincere, consistent attitude toward society and the people around them. The lack of principled attitudes generates many vices which harm the society and the personality as such.

It is known that Lenin did not indiscriminately reject compromises either in the political struggle or in everyday life. However, he never compromised on questions of principle, that is, those questions on whose solutions depended whether the objective truth would be recognized or a deviation from it followed; whether the set goal would be achieved or forgotten; and whether a firm political course would be pursued or spontaneously occurring events be helplessly registered.

In the struggle of ideas and in adopting important political decisions Lenin never made concessions, even if they seemed to promise temporary advantages.

Lenin's relations with his party comrades, like-minded persons, and ideological and political opponents were always characterized by a principled attitude. Traces of personal sympathies or antipathies never made themselves felt in these relations. All kinds of pettiness, envy, anger, vengefulness or vanity were alien to Lenin. He knew how to sincerely respect human dignity and be sensitive and just in his evaluations of his co-workers or his acquaintances. He was capable of severely criticizing his comrades-in-arms if they deserved this, while remaining their thoughtful friend, but he was also capable of severing all personal relations exclusively on the grounds of ideological and political considerations, although at times he regretted the necessity of such a break. Lenin patiently educated and instructed those who made mistakes through lack of knowledge and experience, and carefully reared the revolutionary cadres; he also waged a merciless battle against the conscious opponents of bolshevism and the petty bourgeois good-for-nothing revolutionaries who resisted the proletarian education and did more damage than good. On the whole, in V. Mayakovsky's picturesque words: "To comrades he was a picture of human kindness; to enemies he was harder than iron."

Under contemporary conditions the Leninist principled attitude is no less indispensable and its role in activating moral awareness has not decreased. The Soviet people, under the tested leadership of the communist party, continue to develop and deepen this very revolutionary cause for which the bolsheviks sacrificed themselves with such self-oblivion. This cause is by no means completed by building socialism, be it even mature socialism. This question is clear to us and does not require any special commentaries. As for the question of what is nowadays required from a principled builder of communism--what the lack of principle leads to in practice and what it costs economically and morally--this question does require serious examination.

Of course this concerns primarily the communists, party organs and organizations, and officials who are entrusted with regulating and governing the development of all the spheres of public life. For them the highest manifestation of principled attitude is in approaching every task in a broad and state-minded manner while strictly implementing the government and party

decisions aimed at promoting the common good and showing irreconcilability to shortcomings, and to all and every deviation from the principle of socialist collectivism and to the manifestations of alien psychology and morality.

However, the party organizations still do not always exercise the required control over the activity of the administrations of enterprises, institutions, kolkhozes, and sovkhozes, and they do not always evaluate in a bolshevik and principled way the unseemly deeds of those leaders who cover themselves by adopting the appearance of caring for the well-being of a labor collective and by relying on various allegedly objective circumstances.

Often the timely materials coming from the organs of the people's control as well as signals contained in the letters from the working people are examined in a biased fashion, if not completely ignored, and the officials guilty of violating the Soviet law are only called to account by the party when the danger of criminal charges becomes clear. The numerous critical statements appearing in our press and the editorial mail of KOMMUNIST give sufficient grounds for drawing such conclusions.

It is precisely this connivance and lack of principle that explain facts such as the adoption of scientifically unsubstantiated or even notoriously obsolete designs for building production and communal projects; the commissioning of shops and whole plants that have many imperfections; and the unfinished railways and roads, apartment houses, and everyday service enterprises. It also explains why the overconsumption of materials, the overexpenditure of funds, and the waste of agricultural produce is simply written off.

It is of course not easy to adopt a principled attitude, particularly under the conditions of a certain shortage of these or those resources, the demands of the economic mechanism, and pressures on the part of certain authorities or high-ranking figures who wish their department to look good so that mistakes and shortcomings, which could bring about undesirable conclusions at a higher level, do not come out. That is why certain individuals forget their duty as communists and citizens and make bargains with their consciences. Instead of universally defending the state interests, these individuals find it much "easier" to close their eyes to all sorts of disgraceful things, reconcile themselves to the unhealthy moral-psychological climate existing in the collective, and avoid coming into conflict with high-handed bureaucrats and those who use their official status for profit, as well as demagogues, idlers, and discipline violators.

Moral perfection is one of the most important aspects of the communist ideal of a free and comprehensively developing personality. It is reached not only and not primarily by sermons on morality, although verbal educational is of course necessary. For the individual to express himself freely through his creative work under the conditions of the collectivist relations of comradeship and mutual assistance with the clearly recognized socially significant goal, through work which has become the first vital requirement of a socialist personality--this is the chief core which directs the process of moral education in the genuinely communist spirit. This is precisely what the formula of organically combining labor, ideopolitical, and moral education, as elaborated by the party, signifies. It must be firmly understood

what it means to be a collectivist in the true sense of the word, that is, to possess the main quality, which basically distinguishes a socialist personality from a bourgeois one.

This is a big, complex, and multifaceted question. However, to sum up its essence it can be said that to be a collectivist means to be able to guide one's own striving for self-assertion and for satisfying one's own requirements and interests in such a way that at least it never turns into opposing oneself to the other people and to the society as a whole and into the unjustified wish to give the society less than is taken from it. As for its fullest expression, the collectivist feeling manifests itself as of the labor collective, class, and the society as a whole, and to be ready and able to put under certain conditions the latter before the former. Is it very important in this context what is understood under self-assertion and which individual requirements and interests should be given priority.

If self-assertion in society is understood as fulfilling one's vain desire to "make a career" at any cost, to rise "above others," gain power over other people and revel in it, if this is also connected (and, at times, only connected) with possessing things and with what is nowadays usually referred to as prestigious consumption, whereas work is viewed only as a forced means of earning a living, then it will be impossible to make a true collectivist out of such an individual. Every one of those "whose gaze does not travel beyond his own trough" is voluntarily or involuntarily an individualist.

Careerism and acquisition-mania destroy the genuinely human--intellectual--demands and confine the inner world of the individual to achieving his petty, egoistic aims. It is as if the law of increasing want does not exist for such people. Whatever these people do, however well--on the surface--they perform their duties, they still primarily search for "their own profit" always and everywhere, and in the end they display without fail their individualistic tendencies.

This was well described by Ho Chi Minh: "Individualism runs counter to revolutionary morality and if it survives in us, be it even to a negligible degree, it will wait for its chance to develop and suppress the intellectual qualities of the revolutionary and prevent him from sacrificing all his intellectual forces to the struggle for the revolutionary cause."

Communists do not insist on rejecting earthly goods and living a life of ascetism. The best evidence of this is the constant concern of the communist party and the Soviet state for raising the well-being of the people. However, this cannot be an aim in itself for the communists and for the socialist individual as such. This is just a necessary means of infinitely perfecting and intellectually and morally enriching the individual.

The bolshevist ethics and the communist morality are far from being passive regulators of social relations and the relations between individuals. They are among the most dynamic and powerful forces of our development, which is again both social and individual. It is necessary for the Soviet people, and for communists in particular, to always keep this in mind.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1983

CSO: 1802/12

ON THE MAIN DIRECTION

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 6, Apr 83 pp 68-79

[Article by V. Kabaidze, general director of the Ivanovo Machine Tool-Building Production Association imeni 50-Letiya SSSR]

[Text] The November 1982 CPSU Central Committee Plenum formulated the responsible task of accelerating the conversion of the country's national economy to the track of intensification and paying particular attention during the forthcoming years to increasing the pace of labor productivity--the main economic efficiency indicator. This requires the fuller utilization of the opportunities offered by scientific and technical progress, the persistent practical utilization of the achievements of science, technology and progressive experience and the creation of the necessary economic and organizational conditions which stimulate quality and highly productive toil.

The course of economic intensification requires the solution of a number of ripe problems. Comrade Yu. V. Andropov, CPSU Central Committee general secretary, emphasized at the November plenum that "extensive organizational work must be done by the party organizations, economic managers and engineering and technical personnel so that each of these tremendous and important tasks be considered not only on the sectorial level but on the level of each plant, shop, sector and, if you wish, individual workplace."

The economy of developed socialism has entered the path of the qualitative reorganization of social production forces. The depth of the scope, scale and pace of this reorganization depend entirely on the creative activeness of the working people and the extent of their participation in the scientific and technical revolution. That is what makes so important the role of initiative and innovation research, mastery of progressive experience and ability to utilize the increasing opportunities available to each production collective.

Processing Centers

Production automation is the most efficient and active means for upgrading labor productivity and improving the quality of output. Its accelerated development today is an imperative of the time and a vital socioeconomic need facing our society which is laying the material and technical foundations for communism. Enterprise experience proves that wherever automation has become the center of technical policy a great deal has been accomplished by the labor collectives.

Fifteen years ago, the Ivanovo Heavy Machine Tool Building Plant, which produces general-purpose boring machine tools, was among the lagging. Marketing plans were not fulfilled and the technical standard of the goods was low. Starting with the beginning of the 1970s, the plant's collective, which actively joined the competition for increased production efficiency and improved quality, focused its efforts along the main direction--automation. The enterprise undertook the simultaneous solution of two interrelated problems: first, the development and production of machine tools with digital programming and, subsequently, multioperational machine tools (processing centers); second, the installation of automated equipment in the plant's shops. As a result, during the 10th Five-Year Plan the plant was able to increase its volume of goods marketed by 50 percent with the same number of workers; 61 percent of its machine tool output was renovated and the share of items awarded the pentagonal mark of honor rose to 45 percent.

The plant's efforts to increase the production of aggressive equipment was highly rated in L. I. Brezhnev's congratulations. "Such latest equipment," he said, "enables us to raise machine-building technology and metal-processing automation to a qualitatively new level. It ensures the solution of topical problems of upgrading production efficiency. The latest multioperational digitally programmed machine units, produced by the Ivanovo machine tool builders, increased labor productivity by several hundred percent and make it possible to organize their automated operation."

In the first 2 years of the new five-year plan the volume of output increased by 25.2 percent compared with 1980. The share of the latest models of processing centers accounted for 72.8 percent. Now, after the production reorganization at the plant, automation is being applied and long-term development factors have been enacted, ensuring steady labor productivity growth. Our collective is planning to reach an annual increase in output of 10 to 12 percent and triple the production of processing centers during the five-year plan.

Any enterprise can achieve high rates of production updating and higher labor productivity. To this effect, however, the efforts of the collective must be focused on the development and practical implementation of a number of measures for the reorganization of the production process on the basis of scientific and technical progress. In the course of such reorganization the greatest attention must be paid to one of the most important problems--small-series production.

Domestic machine building has achieved definite results in the field of automation. The production of automated lines and programmed machine tools and the number of automated sectors and shops is increasing with every passing year; the manufacturing and utilization of industrial robots (manipulators) and other automated facilities has been undertaken. This enables us to upgrade the socioeconomic efficiency of the production process and relieve workers of heavy physical work. However, as we discuss automation successes, we must not ignore the entire complexity of this problem and the considerable difficulties standing on the path of its solution. So far the best results have been achieved in large-series and mass production and the manufacturing

of large batches of parts. Matters are far worse in terms of the production of single- or small-series items, the labor intensiveness of which remains very high. Yet it is a relatively unknown fact that most parts (more than half of the total number) are manufactured on an individual basis or in small series. This structure is characteristic of the condition of the entire contemporary global machine-building process and is based on a certain stable development trend.

Most machine-building enterprises produce a large variety of items made individually or in small thousand-piece batches. On the basis of traditional technology, the production structure has also affected the structure of the machine tools used, particularly the high percentage of general-purpose manually controlled machine tools used in all operations such as machining, drilling, boring and milling. Their productivity is low, for which reason the steadily increasing volume of output of the machine-building sectors has already resulted in severe job scarcity. The problem of accelerating the pace of automation in small-series production is becoming increasingly urgent.

One of the ways to resolve it is the creation of specialized intersectorial production facilities. Standardization enables us to consolidate batches of parts, the production of which is concentrated on specialized sectors, shops and enterprises, which makes their automation possible. This important factor in upgrading the efficiency of technological processes in machine building, based on improvements in their organization, must be comprehensively used. We must surmount the aspiration of some enterprise managers to engage in a "barter economy." However, we must also take into consideration the actual possibility that a reduction in small-series production achieved through this method may be if not overcompensated at least balanced by the effect of the opposite trend which has made itself tangible in recent decades. According to specialist forecasts, over the next 20 years we should expect a doubling in the machined items and an increase in the complexity of manufactured parts caused by the increasing demands related to processing precision and quality. An increasing number of operations will be required in the manufacturing of such parts.

The reason for such a significant and fast increase in the variety of parts should be sought in the acceleration of scientific and technical progress, the expanded scale of machine building, the steady updating of its output and the trend toward highly efficient and strictly specialized machine tools and presses which meet the demand of a very limited range of consumers, as well as the production of one-of-a-kind equipment of increased unit capacity. The number of parts needed for some modern large machines and machine units is measured no longer in terms of hundreds or even thousands but in hundreds of thousands; for example, a rail-and-section mill has half a million parts. As a whole, the number of parts needed in machine building will reach into the billions. Although a considerable percentage will be accounted for by assembly lines, nevertheless, as the production of one-of-a-kind machines or machines manufactured in small batches increases, even with the greatest possible standardization the number of parts which cannot be assembly line-produced will increase. Consequently, automated machine-tool lines will be

unable to resolve the problem any more than multiple-purpose manually controlled machine tools. This means that the pace of economic intensification and the growth of its socioeconomic efficiency will depend increasingly on the higher efficiency of the production of individual items or small batches.

A number of people believe that this urgent problem can be resolved through the use of single-purpose programmed machine tools. Our plant as well used such equipment for a while until practical experience convinced us that this was not the proper method for automating small-series production. The programmed general-purpose machine tools could double labor productivity in series production but become undereffective in processing small batches. Naturally, this is due not to the limited possibilities of electronics but the obsolete technology based on the use of multiple-purpose machine tools. The main principle governing traditional metal-processing technology in metal cutting is the division of operations among different machine tools. For a while this technology increased labor productivity considerably. Thanks to specialization and the development of individual operations, the increased speed of processing by the machine tool reduced machining time.

It would be no exaggeration to say that said technological principle has largely exhausted its possibilities in the use of small-series production. Its shortcomings which adversely affect socioeconomic production efficiency, are becoming increasingly clear. One of the principal ones among them is the low machine-tool utilization coefficient. In the separation of operations (which is continuing to increase) the parts must be set and removed for each operation. This takes a great deal of time and affects precision. As a result, even with a maximal load carried by the machine tool in the course of a shift, the share of the auxiliary time is nearly double that of machine time. Moving costs related to shifting the parts from one machine tool to another increase substantially. This increases production costs, complicates management and increases the volume of unfinished production.

With a traditional technology the profession of the machine tool worker is less demanding in terms of his general educational level but increased in terms of apprenticeship. The latter frequently involves physically hard and monotonous labor. It is not astounding that in recent years, as the educational standards of young people have increased, the machine tool skill has begun to lose its former prestige.

At the present time there are vacancies in machine tool jobs in a number of sectors. This hinders the increase in the shift coefficient and lowers capital returns. Under traditional technology, based on the use of multiple-purpose machine tools in small-series production, any further increase in output can be accomplished essentially through extensive means which require even additional manpower. That is why a conversion to new technology becomes so important. Essentially this means combining and integrating all necessary operations within a single machine tool. Such machine tools, currently produced by our industry, are described as multipurpose, multioperational or processing centers.

The structural principle of the processing center is simple: it is a machine tool equipped with a set of tools which consecutively, as instructed by a computer, are engaged in the spindle and led to the parts to be machined secured to replaceable benches. Drilling, cutting, milling, boring and even turning and planing operations are carried out sequentially. Parts and instruments are changed automatically, as programmed, and take no more than a few seconds. The entire set of machining operations can be frequently accomplished automatically, with a single control.

The use of processing centers sharply increases labor productivity compared with multiple-purpose machine tools, ranging from a factor of 3 to 8. The difference in productivity grows the more labor-intensive the parts are (i.e., as the number of operations and stricter precision requirements increase). Such a considerable economic benefit is achieved above all thanks to the fact that the machining time of the processing center reaches 60 to 75 percent compared with 25-35 percent with a general-purpose machine tool. Hence the high economic value of multioperational machine tools: despite their rather high cost they pay for themselves in 2 to 5 years.

The advantages of combined operations include a shortening of the work cycle, outlays for fittings, release of production areas, and considerable decrease in the number of servicing personnel performing basic and auxiliary work. Since the need to shift parts from one machine tool to another is eliminated, moving costs are reduced and the production organization itself is improved. Multiple-transport flows, which sometimes become quite confusing, are eliminated. The management of the production process becomes simplified, which makes it possible to improve planning and ensure the rhythmical work of all sections and shops.

One of the most important advantages of the processing centers is the fact that they are particularly efficient in small-series production. Here they ensure the lowest possible cost of machining which, as the number of parts in a series declines, shows a very insignificant increase.

The use of processing centers changes the nature of labor substantially. The computer assumes a number of functions performed by the machine tool worker related to physically heavy work and requiring significant stress. All that are left are control functions and programming, i.e., a more skilled type of work with a significant creative content.

The module--a multioperational machine tool with automatically shifting satellite benches--ensures further increase in the productivity of processing centers and reduces the number of servicing personnel. In the case of such benches the first shift places the parts to be machined subsequently by the second and third shifts; a single operator could supervise the work of several such centers.

Processing centers have been practically tested in a number of machine-building sectorial enterprises and proved the great advantages of a conversion to the new technology. However, the principle of combining operations, on which they are based, has not as yet revealed its full opportunities. Acquired

experience proves that the range of application of multioperational machine tools could be broadened through the automation of a number of new processes not only in small series but in large series and even mass production.

Acceleration of Technical Progress

The time factor must be strictly taken into consideration in undertaking the production of multioperational machine tools, the technical and economic indicators of which meet the highest contemporary standards.

In modern machine building the flow of alternating technical ideas, which offer extensive opportunities for increased labor productivity, exceptionally speeds up the process of equipment moral obsolescence. Any delay in the implementation of a new idea inevitably reduces the economic results which could be obtained under different circumstances. Currently the duration of the "science-production" cycle remains high. In many enterprises technical production preparations (design and technological preparations for the manufacturing of a new item) take no less than 4 to 5 years. In frequent cases the time period is increased by the fact that the plant designers must go through a number of instances each of which has the right to a "veto," without, however, bearing responsibility for the quality of the produced machine. The production of a new machine tool requires 100 signatures, 35 of them with seals. Most of the working time of technologists is used no better. They must spend their time in providing unnecessarily detailed descriptions of technological processes, although the fact that few of them will be of any use is well-known.

Furthermore, the entire process of technical production preparations is usually broken down into stages which must be covered consecutively. As a result the technologists wait for the designers; the production workers wait for the technologists; the designers wait for the production workers who manufacture the prototype or the zero series. This leads to a certain discoordination in the interrelated units involved in the production of a new commodity, which affects both time and quality.

The personnel in our plant properly realized that unless the organization of technical preparations was to be changed substantially equipment greatly needed in machine building could not be designed and manufactured within the shortest possible time. Pledging to create a multioperational programmed machine tool during the year and assuming full responsibility for its manufacturing, the plant was given permission to reduce the number of steps and coordinations to a minimum. Substantial changes were made in the technical preparations process as well, which also resulted in substantial time savings.

The faster technology develops the more complex it becomes and the greater becomes the role of the subjective, the human factor as a constructive foundation in the production process. In order successfully to resolve the complex set of problems facing our plant an atmosphere of creative search had to be developed, involving the participation of the entire collective. It was precisely on this that the plant party organization focused its political education work. The objective of the plant's party members, who initiated

the socialist competition under the slogan "Accelerated Development Of and Maximal Returns From New Equipment," was to reach every working person and make him aware of the importance of his role in resolving the major problems facing the collective. The initiative of the party members and the personal examples they set of creative attitude toward the work met with broad response and developed a large following. A tradition has developed at the plant: the collective closely follows the schedule of a main processing center prototype from a sketch and blueprint to assembly and testing, widely reacting to even the slightest delay, and helping if necessary.

The distinguishing feature of the competition is the active participation in it of all plant workers and representatives of all skills and their concentration on achieving end results as quickly as possible, and their desire to increase their creative contribution to the common project. The activities of plant inventors and rationalizers, many of whom are young, have become noticeably energized. By showing steady concern for improving the design of the processing centers, frontrankers and collectives of departments, shops and sectors are struggling for higher labor productivity and reducing the time needed for the completion of new items.

Thus, production innovator electrician B. A. Bulashev developed a special tool which made the use of air-plasma cutting of steel scrap possible. This process, which was applied initially in casting, quadrupled labor productivity. A new method for assembling two models of serially produced processing centers, based on individual creative plans of the personnel at the head technologist's department, was applied in 1979-1980. The duration of the assembling cycle was reduced by a factor of 3 and quality and reliability improved. Many such examples could be cited, all of them confirming the creative attitude toward the work triggered by the competition. Since 1976, every year the plant has been producing a new model processing center and mastering its series manufacturing. The time needed for mastering the production of the new equipment has been reduced by a factor of 3-4.

The question is frequently asked, how were such results achieved, considering that as yet the design and engineering bureaus had no noted designers and that the young design bureau had no experience in the creation of the multi-operational programmed machine tools. The answer is simple: we are steadily learning, sometimes from our own mistakes. A high feeling of responsibility has been developed in every single worker who was given the greatest possible creative autonomy. No professional "taboos" were imposed on young designers, which so frequently block the road to research, and they were able to resolve problems through the use of methods which may have appeared unpromising at first glance.

The activities of all participants in the development of processing centers were restructured radically. They were based on three requirements, the expediency of which was confirmed by practical experience. First, creating "ideal" technology. In other words, the design of the center should be such that the only thing required in machining a part would be to secure the piece of metal to the tool. Whenever this was impossible, the number of systems was to be reduced to a minimum.

Secondly, the prototype was to consist of a minimum of parts (no more than 500 for some of them). The fewer parts a machine has the greater its reliability and the lesser its metal-intensiveness. This difficult design requirement could be met only by making the fullest possible use of all electronic possibilities, i.e., by creating a state-of-the-art machine.

Thirdly, along with the drawings the model was to be produced bypassing the prototype stage. This shortens series production by 1 to 2 years but also changes the usual work method of the designers. Now they must design a machine ready for production from scratch, with no corrections and changes allowed with a prototype. Understandably, in this case responsibility for the quality of the design becomes immeasurably higher, which forces the designer to work with total creative dedication.

Time savings and improved quality were achieved at the plant precisely thanks to the use of the comprehensive-combined method. We abandoned the procedure according to which preparations for a new design follow sequential stages as the leading designer, who implemented the main technical idea, could move on from one block or assembly to another.

Experience proves that it is far more efficient to break down the design of the future machine tool into blocks, which are developed on a parallel basis. This increases the creative autonomy and responsibility of the designers and leads them into the search for new solutions.

We were able considerably to reduce the time also by combining at the design stage the work of designers, metallurgists, technologists and electronic workers. On the one hand, the design must be technological, otherwise its manufacturing will not improve economic results. On the other, in producing a new machine all technological advantages must be used: reliability, productivity, speed and precision. It was decided to involve the technologists in the development of the individual machine tool blocks. In the final account, this made the design entirely ready for production. The possibility developed of manufacturing individual parts, assemblies and blocks in the various shops even before the work on the overall design was completed.

The new method used in designing and manufacturing a complex machine tool such as a processing center enabled us not only considerably to reduce the time but attain high quality as well. Demand for such machine tools is rapidly increasing in our industry. Actually, several dozen processing centers manufactured by us are being used by Western companies as well. Despite the exceptionally strict operational conditions (particularly during the period covered by the guarantee), the centers are working properly and there have been no complaints on the part of their owners. Competitiveness on the world market has become, therefore, a real criterion of the quality of the plant's work.

As we assess the results of our work we are far from believing that all problems have been resolved. If our experience could be of use to other enterprises and production associations--which, we hope, will be the case--specific practical conclusions should be drawn from it as well.

The importance of the tie between science and production is increasing with every passing year. This organic tie, dictated by the very logic of scientific and technical progress, must be comprehensively strengthened. We must eliminate the still-frequent organizational disunity between science and production. The work of some scientific research institutes and design bureaus is characteristic of a splintering of topics and insufficient consideration of practical requirements. Sometimes this forces the enterprises to look for something discovered a long time ago, and to empiricism, depriving them of the possibility of using the latest technological achievements in their field. On the other hand, some enterprises show no interest in promising research and developments carried out by scientific research institutes and design bureaus of whom they demand no more than the updating of obsolete machine designs.

Practical experience indicates that such shortcomings can be surmounted through the establishment of scientific-production associations. In the machine tool industry this could be accomplished on the basis of the leading enterprises with the scientific research institutes and design bureaus which service them. Such enterprises must take over the entire production of the finished goods in the sector. Associations such as these should include respecialized enterprises which will manufacture complementing items and individual parts, instruments and fittings.

The development of scientific production associations in machine-tool building becomes particularly important today as industry is undertaking a mass conversion to production automation. The machine tool builders must not only supply the economic sectors with advanced labor tools but with the most advanced technology and help them to apply it as quickly as possible. This calls for taking precisely into consideration the production conditions of the individual consumer and to produce not only individual "impersonal" machine tools to which, as is currently the case, the production process must be adapted, but equipment sets and automated machine systems which would provide the specific enterprise with the most efficient technology. This formulation of the problem is dictated by the characteristics of the development of machine building at the present stage. Understandably, this problem can be resolved only by large scientific-production complexes.

As a new organizational form of interaction between science and production, the scientific-production association increases the efficiency of research, drastically reduces the cycle covered by a technical idea from the moment of its appearance to its practical utilization in the national economy and leads to the achievement of the highest national economic results. However, in order to obtain from it all it can give in the acceleration of technical progress, we must eliminate the major shortcomings in planning an economic incentive which are holding it back. Under the existing practice an enterprise or association which has mastered the production of a new item is not released from the production of an older one. Planning has been based "on the level reached," without proper consideration of the real difficulties and occasional outlays which production updating always entails. Under such circumstances it is sometimes simply impossible to fulfill the plan for all indicators. As a result, enterprises which have produced obsolete items for

many years find themselves in a better situation from the viewpoint of economic incentive compared with those which have mastered the production of new equipment.

The search for new ways does not always, not to mention immediately, lead us in a promising direction. It invariably involves a certain risk and considerable material outlays. A sensible risk is economically justified even if it ends in failure; the refusal to search for new technical principles, however, would be far more damaging. Unfortunately, this important aspect is still not suitably considered in stimulating scientific research, experimental design and technological work by production associations, which limits their scale and results. In our view, in defining the planned norms of withholdings for the unified science and technology development fund of the individual sectors the growing need for expanding scientific research should be taken more fully into consideration. The distribution of this fund among large production and scientific-production associations itself should be made directly dependent on the contribution made by each one of them and on the size of the expected economic results which the production of new commodities would yield.

Flexibility of the Production Apparatus

In addition to the unquestionable advantages we mentioned, the processing centers have yet one more particularly valuable one. Given an adequate number and proper use of such machine tools the machine-building enterprise can reduce the time needed for mastering the production of new technology several hundred percent.

Under the conditions of the scientific and technical revolution, the steady and fast updating of the structure of the overall social product becomes one of the topical problems in the development of the production forces the solution of which determines the growth rates of labor productivity and the fullest possible satisfaction of social requirements. In the final account, the decisive word here belongs to the production process, the enterprise. Reducing the time needed for the development of a new idea is in itself insufficient in terms of accelerating scientific and technical progress. It is also very important to reduce the time needed for its industrial manufacturing. A number of cases can be cited in which a valuable discovery or invention has remained on the prototype stage for years, awaiting the day when it can be produced in an industrial series.

One of the main reasons for this fact, once again, is the technological base of the contemporary enterprise. As the design of machines, machine units and machine tools becomes more complex, so does the technology of their manufacturing. This gives the production process a certain rigidity and stiffness. Under such circumstances, converting to the production of new commodities calls for the replacing of many types of equipment and a major restructuring of the entire production facility, which takes a great deal of time and requires additional material outlays.

This trend is manifested particularly clearly in metal cutting, which accounts for a considerable percentage of all outlays in machine building. Today the share of all-purpose or other manually controlled machine tools remains high in the machine-processing shops of machine-building plants. Frequently the production of a new item calls for totally replacing the entire technological equipment, which numbers in the hundreds and even thousands. Designing and manufacturing the new equipment requires time and additional outlays. The machine-building plants expand their instrument-manufacturing shops, as a result of which the traditional technology of small-series production is expanded.

In large series or assembly-line production combined machine tools and automated lines need at least a refitting in converting to the production of a new commodity. However, in frequent cases even a minor change in the design of a new item, which, however, substantially improves its quality, calls for the total replacement of machine tool lines. That is simply why many enterprises try to avoid production reorganization as long as possible, producing the same type of items which are rapidly becoming obsolete year after year.

The designers of automated machine-tool lines are quite familiar with this kind of rigidity, for which reason they focus their efforts on finding efficient means for the fast resetting of these lines. Although some results have already been achieved, we must clearly realize that if we keep the essential structure of automated lines based on a traditional technological principle of machine tool division of operations the possibility of rapidly reorganizing the production process and its dynamism become difficult. It is no accident that in designing new technological processes, designers and technologists in many machine-building sectors are increasingly relying on the use of processing centers. With their high technical and economic indicators, multioperational machine tools make it possible to convert to the production of new models without replacing expensive equipment and within an extremely short time, models which, in terms of parameters and structural characteristics, are substantially different from their predecessors. With an optimized set of instruments and general-purpose fittings (which do not have to be manufactured anew on each occasion), most frequently the conversion of a machine-processing shop to the production of a new commodity may be reduced to replacing the attachments connected to the multioperational machine tools and the designing of new programs. This saves time and the development period is reduced by several hundred percent.

Although we rate the advantages of processing centers highly, we should not simplify the matter by assuming that they should entirely eliminate the use of multiple-purpose and programmed machine tools and automated machine tool lines. Actually, by expanding the manufacturing and use of processing centers, increasing their share and steadily improving the structure of the machine tool fleet, it is a question of making it optimal, i.e., such as to yield the highest possible labor productivity, ensure the flexibility and mobility of the production machinery and relieve people from physically heavy work. This was the objective of the Ivanovo Machine Tool Building Association imeni 50-Letiya SSSR in undertaking the technical retooling of the

production process. The number of programmed machine tools and processing centers increased gradually and we have submitted no request for multiple-purpose machine tools since 1972.

Multioperational machine tools can display their economic advantages only if specific requirements are met, the most important of which is their concentration. Estimates have proved that a minimal number of machine tools must be procured, without which their use becomes unsuitable.

Concentration offers the possibility of reducing the cost of servicing (relatively fewer servicing personnel are needed for a larger number of machine tools), and creating automated sectors working under conditions which make the maximal increase in machine time possible. Realizing the great importance of using processing centers in terms of increasing labor productivity and, particularly, developing a flexible production system, i.e., capable of quick refitting, the plant workers worked to upgrade their efficiency. From the very beginning, this type of latest equipment was concentrated in separate specialized sectors, the purpose of which was to eliminate bottlenecks which arise as a result of the high labor-intensiveness and complexity of manufactured items. The production system was reorganized in 1973-1974; the management of the automated sectors was transferred from the machine shops to an autonomous production subunit--the programmed processing technological department (TOPO).

The creation of this autonomous subunit enabled us to ensure the efficient interaction among all services which determine the uninterrupted work of programmed machine tools. It also enabled us efficiently to resolve numerous and sometimes quite complex problems related to the extensive application.

The TOPO is the first subdivision of its kind in the sector. Its organization enabled us to achieve high production maneuverability and reduce maximally the time needed for preparing the manufacturing of parts for new machines. The attention of the new department was focused on intensifying equipment utilization. The machine tools work in two shifts. The overall shift coefficient reached 1.87, which is considerably superior to the sectorial level. At the same time, we resolved the problem of increasing machine time and drastically reducing machine tool idling. A system for the automatic recording of idling and efficient summoning of repair and servicing personnel was applied. It proved to be an efficient means for upgrading the efficiency of programmed machine tools and processing centers. Efficient supervision of the work of each machine tool enables us to take prompt measures to eliminate existing breakdowns and to enhance the feeling of responsibility of the entire servicing personnel.

Brigades numbering from 15 to 30 people were set up at the automated sectors within the technological department for programmed processing. The basic workers are paid according to the hourly-bonus system, in accordance with their skill and the fulfillment of the monthly assignment by the entire brigade. A wage supplement is added of 50 percent for overfulfillment of assignments and 10 percent for machine tool tuneup without outside help.

The basic indicator of the brigade's work--the efficiency of programmed machine tools--is computed as the ratio between the amount of time spent in fulfilling the machine program plus the time for setting and removing the parts and the time during which the machine tool was in operation. The norming, which is achieved with the help of time measurements, ensures the proper substantiation of this indicator.

The TOPO has its repair service which includes highly specialized workers in electronics, electrical engineering, hydraulics and precision mechanics. Their task is to reduce the equipment idling to a minimum during repairs, the taking of preventive breakage and wearout measures, determining reasons for breakdowns and breaks and updating the equipment. The wages of the repair workers are based not on the amount of work but on increased machine time. This system of material incentive has directly influenced the efficiency with which progressive types of equipment are used and the idling of which for repair purposes has declined substantially. As a whole, the coefficient of utilization of multioperational machine tools in the programmed processing department has been improving with every passing year. This has meant the use of a reserve thanks to which the association has been able steadily to increase the production of new items without hiring additional workers.

Following are some data on the work of the TOPO. Currently programmed machine tools account for the manufacturing of more than 34 percent of all parts. In many cases parts are machined in the course of a single technological operation as compared with 20 to 40 operations previously; the overall number of operations involving machining has declined by 45 percent. Production automation is having an increasing effect on the growth rates of labor productivity which averaged 42.5 percent during the 10th Five-Year Plan. All of this has influenced the economic efficiency of the enterprise, particularly in terms of capital returns. Between 1975 and 1982 such returns increased from 82 kopeks to 1.13 rubles per ruble capital assets.

The experience of the Ivanovo Machine Tool Building Production Association has drawn the attention of economic and scientific workers and specialists. It was studied by representatives of 800 enterprises and organizations in 1981 and 1,300 in 1982. The association workers willingly share their experience and are always ready to help in the application of the new production organization method and new technology. However, we must recognize that matters have not progressed beyond the acquaintance stage. The TOPO system, which has proved itself in practical work, remains alone. Most enterprises use their programmed machine tools on a scattered basis, which lowers their efficiency. This situation must be changed. The November 1982 CPSU Central Committee Plenum particularly emphasized the fact that the central economic organs, the Academy of Sciences, the State Committee for Science and Technology and the ministries must not simply propagandize the new equipment and new labor methods but identify and eliminate the specific difficulties which stand in the way of scientific and technical progress.

The TOPO--a flexible production system--which was developed at the plant will enable us this five-year plan to master the production of new types of processing centers. Between 1983 and 1984 one-half of all manufactured

multioperational machine tools will consist of modules which can be easily assembled in automated sections; during this period we shall also undertake the production of a "globe center"--a machine tool for the automated processing of particularly complex parts (five sides with a single setting); the prototype of a "block-center," which will combine the advantages of multi-operational machine tools with multiple-spindle and aggregate tools, to be used in large series production, will come out in 1984. Future plans call for the development of a totally automated sector of processing centers serviced by robots.

Acquiring progressive experience bit by bit, and making their contribution to the development and application of technical innovations, the plant workers are increasing labor productivity and upgrading production efficiency; with every passing year they are increasing the production of new, more complex and highly productive types of equipment.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1983

5003

CSO: 1802/12

TERRESTRIAL COSMONAUTICS PROGRAM

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 6, Apr 83 pp 80-90

[Article by Academician Hero of Socialist Labor V. Mishin, Lenin Prize laureate]

[Text] The implementation of the comprehensive state scientific and technical programs and the fulfillment of the five-year plan presume the creation and extensive utilization of new production technologies and the intensification and efficient concentration of scientific and design-engineering developments. The efficiency of production and design substantially increases by coordinating tasks and ensuring the close interaction between scientific and technological sectors. Cosmonautics plays a suitable role in this progressive process.

Soviet cosmonautics is a full-fledged economic sector with inexhaustible potential for increasing its direct yields and exerting a extensive beneficial influence on the methodological base of industry at large. Thanks to the concern of the party and the government, cosmonautics is becoming a powerful productive force which is opening new horizons in science and production. Academicians S. P. Korolev and M. V. Keldysh, the outstanding scientists of our time, who were at the origins of Soviet practical cosmonautics, ensured the high purposefulness of its programs aimed at comprehensively meeting national economic requirements.

I

Cosmonautics is a synthesis of science and technology, based on new ideas representing not only the current level reached in machine building, cybernetics, radio engineering and the power industry but also advanced principles governing the development and organization of major technical and socioproduction systems. Inherent in space technology are exceptionally high rates of renovation and fast moral obsolescence. The study of its history enables us to determine the motive forces and principles governing the development of the contemporary dynamic production process. As the offspring of scientific and technical progress, cosmonautics becomes its powerful booster.

There have been at least three generations of space systems over the past 25 years. This was caused by the development of the element base of electronics, the qualitative improvement of communications, mechanical and power-generating systems, the saturation of ground and ship systems with computerized equipment, and the drastic expansion of the scale of space programs. The elements

of space technology--means of delivery, automated apparatus and manned vehicles and the service complexes on the ground and in flight developed monolithically, forming unified large technical systems.

In one-quarter of a century more than 1,800 Soviet satellites and artificial planets of the solar system have participated in the solution of a variety of scientific and technical and economic problems. The dynamics of the launchings through the years confirms the conversion from the quantitative to qualitative development and the creation of multifunctional high reliability and power systems and from the use of isolated instruments to the development of space target complexes.

In accordance with the long-term program, a universal system of four earth-orbiting carriers and vehicles for interplanetary orbits, both automatic and manned, with a relatively small mass ranging from 1,200 kilograms to 7 tons, was developed on the basis of the Vostok rocket carrier. It was subsequently expanded with the addition of the heavy Proton carriers and small carriers which proved their value in the Interkosmos program.

Korolev's standardized Vostok system--both reliable and inexpensive--proved to be exceptionally durable. The fruitfulness of our own approach to the solution of problems and refusal to imitate foreign prototypes, orientation toward the actually achieved technological standard, proper choice of the scale of the objects, the original block assembly of the initial rocket and the choice of promising fuel components and control principles enabled us qualitatively to outstrip the level reached in rocket building. The methodical and gradual development of the technological base ensured an unprecedentedly fast mastery of wide-scale space production.

Starting in 1962, over 1,400 satellites of the multiple-step Kosmos program have performed a number of basic geo- and astrophysical studies and contributed to the structural-technological development of new principles for the development of systems and work processes. The characteristics of space around the earth at altitudes ranging from 150 to 60,000 kilometers are being studied, including the physics of the magnetic, gravity and radiation fields, the ionosphere, the upper atmosphere and the influence of meteors. Problems related to the use of superconductivity, the development of new principles of communications, orientation and deceleration in the upper atmospheric strata and others are being resolved. The program became international in 1967, rallying scientists from the socialist countries.

Starting in 1965 some 70 communications satellites--experimental and economic--of the Orbita and Moskva systems, operating at high elliptical and geostationary orbits, are providing systematic long-range radiotelephone and telegraph communications and transmitting television signals to virtually the entire territory of the USSR. Whereas initially powerful ground stations with large, strictly directional parabolic antennae were a necessary part of the system, the modern systems provide reliable communications using small combined antennae. Today the viewing of television programs is considered as ordinary in the uninhabited parts of Siberia and beyond the polar circle as in Moscow.

The Soviet Meteor system was introduced in 1967. Since then it has been serviced by more than 40 space instruments. Currently efficient meteorological charts showing the dynamics of atmospheric processes are transmitted to forecasting meteorological centers several times daily. The temperature on the earth's surface is determined to the degree, temperature, humidity and altitude pressure diagrams are plotted, wind velocities are computed, and so on. Two-three-day weather, river system and natural meteorological phenomena are forecast with high accuracy. A domestic navigational system is being applied which enables ships and aircraft, guided by working satellites, to compute their own coordinates on the ground with an accuracy of up to 100 meters. The international KOSPAS-SARSAT system for assistance to ships and aircraft in difficulty is being developed.

Going beyond the earth's atmospheric cover and subsequently beyond its gravity field immeasurably expanded the scientific research possibilities of the astrophysical space engines. The study of a wide spectrum of solar, planetary and stellar radiation and of previously unknown outer space sources substantially refined scientific concepts on the origin and development of the solar system and the universe.

The systematic study of the planets within the solar system and their natural satellites was undertaken in 1959 with flight trajectories and, in 1966, with the help of stationary-launched apparatus and Lunokhods. The method chosen for the use of automated systems (the most economical and informative) enabled us to obtain information on the characteristics of the atmospheres and surfaces of the moon, Venus and Mars and to bring to earth and make laboratory studies of lunar soil. The creation of about 50 vehicles of this series and ensuring their reliable work under extreme conditions, dozens and hundreds of millions of kilometers away from earth, helped to resolve scientific problems and substantially enriched the technical arsenal of practical cosmonautics.

Justifiably, the creation of manned space systems--long-term orbital stations and transport and service ships--is legitimately considered the peak of space technology. In the wake of Yu. A. Gagarin, more than 100 cosmonauts have flown in outer space for a combined time of about 9 years, proving the expediency and high efficiency of this new type of human activity. Manned space equipment developed in accordance with its own laws, preparing technical and psychological conditions for valuable creative work in orbit, in flights of long duration in free fall, in reaching open outer space and returning to earth. The length of the expeditions and the amount and complexity of performed tasks increased systematically. From strict functions of controlling the automated equipment, the cosmonauts advanced to cooperation with ground services, autonomous programming and experimental algorithms. From individual flights they progressed to collective work aboard multiple-personnel long-term stations.

The stability of the launches, the impeccable work of the equipment and the seeming ordinariness of current flight programs are a major accomplishment in cosmonautics. The basic idea of the studies, formulated by Academician S. P. Korolev is being fully implemented: "Space for the sake of science, for peaceful objectives only, for the good of man who is tirelessly unraveling

the deepest secrets of nature, is the path along which Soviet space research is being carried out and developing."

Tremendous scientific and technical potential has been acquired, which enables us to advance to the next step in the intensive development of cosmonautics.

II

The history of Soviet cosmonautics convincingly proves the truth that current directions in science and technology are created and developed intensively in accordance with the vital needs of mankind on earth. The topics of future space studies and the ways of development of outer space production were reflected in the "Basic Directions in the Economic and Social Development of the USSR in 1981-1985 and the Period Through 1990." This applies not only to the programmed development of cosmonautics but to sections dealing with basic research, acceleration of technical progress, and the development of industry, the agroindustrial complex, transportation, communications, and social progress.

Whereas in the previous stage studies were essentially focused on the unique conditions of intensive solar radiation, deep vacuum, weightlessness and lack of natural convection, radiation and meteor influences and the study of physiological and psychological possibilities of man, future programs presume, on the basis of the established laws, a conversion to extensive design research, and experimentation with nature, aimed at the development of a new generation of large-scale national economic systems. Having learned how to counteract the factors of outer space, it becomes natural to convert to their extensive advantageous utilization.

As we formulate priority economic programs, we must determine the usefulness of space power industry, the creation of a joint global information-diagnostic service aimed at developing an accurate model of the earth, and forecasting and controlling atmospheric and other natural processes. The parallel creation of a national and international system of space communications involving powerful multipurpose information systems and, subsequently, space analytical and control systems on the socioeconomic level, servicing large areas and economic sectors and combining them, is a topical task. The infinite and ecologically "clean" solar energy, the possibility of putting into orbit energy-intensive industries and the observance and study and, in the future, control of global processes, the universal accessibility of obtaining from or via satellites extensive data on a great variety of subjects, and the obvious expediency of including powerful computers within such a system are the foundations for the economic industrialization of space in the immediate future. This presumes the further specialization of cosmonaut work. Theoretical physicists and experimenters, power industry and radio engineering specialists, geologists, oceanographers, and agricultural and environmental protection specialists will be working alongside pilots and general researchers.

Cosmonautics is becoming actively involved in resolving the next tasks set by the communist party, such as upgrading labor productivity and the power-labor

ratio in industry, implementation of the Food Program, development of new technologies, and improving the principles of scientific management of the national economy.

The energy problem and the principles of economical conversion and transmission of energy from a distance will play some of the main roles in future space programs. Scientists working in the various natural sciences, designers and economists are studying variants of space systems for gathering solar energy and its concentration, transformation and transmission on a scale consistent with the overall consumption of energy by developed countries.

As we know, the generation of electric power based on nonrecoverable minerals holds a dominating position in the country's energy balance. Our subsoil is so rich that proven reserves, even should energy outlays double, would last more than 150 years. However, the consumption of minerals is not the best method for their utilization, for they are valuable chemical raw materials. Fuel-operated machines burns substantial quantities of atmospheric oxygen and the increased share of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere is fraught with the danger of disturbing the current ecological balance--increasing the mean atmospheric temperature, the intensity of ice melting and the rise in the level of the world's oceans.

We also know that the orbit of an artificial earth satellite covering an area perpendicular to the solar flow covering the radius of Moscow's Sadovoye Kol'tso contains almost as much energy as will be generated by all electric power plants in the Soviet Union in 1985. An important advantage of plans for the transformation of solar into electric power is not only the preservation of ground resources and normal conditions for human activity but the possibility of creating high-space energy-consuming industry. Such industries exist. However, they will be developed in the future to an immeasurably greater extent and energy will be their basic "raw material."

Future global systems of space communications and control and management of earth processes will become major consumers. The space industry, which is developing on the basis of modules of viable and life-support systems for large crews will require great amounts of power. Considering the availability of significant amounts of energy, space is the ideal environment for physical experiments, the development of new communications principles, the study of highly concentrated artificial magnetic fields, and conditions for controlled thermonuclear synthesis. No essential difficulties for the distance transmission of concentrated flows of energy aimed at providing space objects with the necessary energy, without the need for their own power systems, exist in outer space. This is one of the means for the creation of a new class of economical electric rocket transportation space vehicles. We should not hasten the implementation of plans for supplying earth projects with space energy until we have studied the physics of interaction between powerful energy flows and the atmosphere.

The principles of the transformation of energy through solar batteries, discussed in the foreign press, is by far not the only solution to the problem. The efficiency of solar batteries, as we know, does not exceed 8-15 percent,

while the mass of a square meter of panel with a power structure weighs several kilograms. It is more likely that the use of film mirror energy concentrators and thermoelectronic transformers may prove more promising. Such systems would enable us to lower the weight of the freight hauled into orbit by 100 to 200 percent. Because of their higher resistance to radiation, they will be significantly more powerful. Whereas the mass of a square meter of a solar concentrator proved to be the equivalent of the mass of a parachute fabric, systems generating a power equivalent to that produced by all hydraulic power plants of the USSR in 1985 may be placed in orbit with 12 to 15 rockets carrying a useful load of 120-150 tons. Such systems would prove to be immeasurably more efficient when interacting with space thermonuclear power systems.

The ideas developed by the Soviet School of Space Power Industry and the critical study of familiar foreign projects enable us to formulate a new space GOELRO plan. Today it is a matter not only facing the creators of power systems but their consumers, with their space variants of experimental and industrial systems.

The purpose of the global geophysical information system, based on combined meteorological, geophysical, geodetic and cartographic services and the solar service (ground and space) is to lay the information base for a future model of the planet earth.

The successes achieved by each one of these services is unquestionable and their progress has been striking. The methods applied by modern space geodesy for computing earth coordinates have a centimeter-level accuracy and are able to determine the annual reciprocal shifting of continents. Color space photographs taken with specially selected solar light and filters are sources of complete information on the structure of the topography of the land and the sea bottom, the composition of the soil and the vegetal cover. Currents, the purity of the water, level of salinity, heat gradients, accumulations of plankton and others are determined for the various oceans and seas. The spectral study of vegetation enables us to determine over huge areas its structure and development level, to forecast crops and plant maturity, and the level of pest contamination. The geo- and astrophysical services are concentrating on the study of the nature of the earth's gravitational, magnetic and radiation fields and the influence of solar processes on them.

However, no general theory has been developed as yet according to which the variety of analyzed phenomena would be considered integrally, adding to the overall picture of the long-term development of nature on earth.

Initially, the purely practical purpose of the system was to provide reliable meteorological 8-10-day forecasts, long-term forecasting of catastrophic natural phenomena, and the origin and dynamics in the development of typhoons, cyclones and anticyclones. According to foreign economists such forecasts alone would fully cover outlays for the development of such a system. The creation of a general multidimensional model of the earth is a key to controlling nature, developing new resources and ensuring the qualitative improvement of the human habitat.

The joint communication-information system is, to a certain extent, the socioeconomic analog of a geophysical information system.

The flow of information simultaneously transmitted via contemporary communications satellites includes several television programs and thousands of telephone and telegraph communications. The level of information of communications systems using promising laser frequencies is vastly superior. Its organization would provide universal communications facilities. On the other hand, computers with their memory banks (which may be located on earth and be accessible via outer space) would enable us to acquire an amount of information equaling large national libraries. The combination of these features within a single system--the concentration of information and the possibility of its fast transmission to requesting subscribers--is the base for designing a prototype of a "collective brain." By becoming universally accessible, the combination of scientific, technical and social experience offers infinite opportunities for improving such an information and training system and mankind itself.

The development of advanced computer complexes should be considered together with the creation of large-scale information and space communications systems. Modern computers are developing in two directions: the development of small (and miniaturized) general-purpose computers which are relatively slow and have a small memory and huge computer banks which can resolve major scientific and national economic problems. The latter would include sectorial systems for automated designing (airplanes, space rocket systems, ships, reactors, one-of-a-kind generators, and so on). Such large systems could model the structure and interconnection among enterprises and industrial sectors, structures for supplying a country with raw materials and energy, and transportation systems.

Such automated machine complexes are becoming increasingly important and largely determine the level of scientific research, the quality of management of industrial sectors and large areas and the most complex technological processes of automated enterprises. Studies of systems on such a broad scale, covering entire industrial sectors and the scientific directions to be followed in their interaction within the national economic structure are needed in resolving a number of related problems. Their components would be sufficiently autonomous and would allow the parallel solution of a number of problems. It would make no sense to duplicate such systems, for duplication affects the quality of a system and its capacity load, reduces the useful work time and affects service standards. Finally, such complexes would decisively constrict engineering services both morally and physically, for they would stipulate fully "human working condition."

Improvements in the quality of communications systems through outer space facilities would enable us to separate the operational-information part of such systems from peripheral control systems and means for portraying and studying the results of research. Already now initial information for the work of some computers may be transmitted by telephone. The projection of this trend makes it easy to conceive of the development of an advanced television receiver as a display panel--a means for controlling computer complexes and presenting information on the process of resolving and determining

the results of a given study. The real possibility appears for an unparalleled concentration of large computer complexes and the creation of sectorial and all-union computer enterprises which would represent huge machines or reserve facilities with complementing functions. Such a system, the access of which would be open to all interested specialists, would provide exhausting basic information and most advanced computing, analyzing and modeling equipment creating a new type of scientific production and scientific organization and management of the national economy.

The organizing functions of specialized space information research systems will be increasing steadily. Space instruments can determine the pace and quality of farmwork with high precision. They can optimize ship and airplane lines and patterns in accordance with meteorological conditions and resolve problems of controlling river flow, irrigation, and establishing a variety of itineraries. A space organizational-research system with more specialized functions could manage scientific and industrial sectors and combine the efforts of specialists in a specific field of knowledge in resolving topical problems.

The new means for data gathering, storage, transmission and processing and promising types of communications and output systems could and should radically change the means of national economic, scientific and technological documentation, excluding or substantially reducing paperwork.

Within the unified system of the national economy, going through its development stage and expanding and intensifying its significance as a scientific, design and technological probe, cosmonautics opens new ways to improving the foundations of economic management and the creation of working systems based on its latest principles.

The implementation of programs on such a scale requires further improvements in automated and manned space systems and orbital vehicles. The development of automated systems will probably take the path of the creation of interacting complexes of two types--multipurpose long-lasting base apparatus and coordinating and guiding centers, and small, systematically replaced sounding instruments which will provide global information. Unless we succeed in upgrading their power to the point of moral obsolescence, the heavy base apparatus will be periodically serviced by manned ships. In the field of manned complexes, in addition to long-term stations and transport apparatus, it will become necessary to develop a series of small, highly maneuverable apparatus for assembly projects, "orbit-to-orbit" flights and individual returning of cosmonauts to earth. The further development of the "earth-orbit" transportation systems appeared to be the most economical in the development of carriers with a one-time useful mass in excess of 100 tons based on two-step traditional block design systems with multiple first-stage utilization. Dropped head modules, based on the principle of the Soyuz apparatus, could bring back to earth machine blocks for repair and reuse. Attention will be paid to the development of the final stages of the carriers which now, after fulfilling their assignment, are "polluting" outer space. The integral constructive solution of problems related to the final stage and useful load and the full utilization of orbital systems and stage structural elements will substantially increase the yield of the mass combined with the speed of outer space.

The formulation and solution of such problems does not cover the entire national economic and scientific possibilities of future cosmonautics or its role in the implementation of the basic stipulations of the 26th Party Congress and the November 1982 CPSU Central Committee Plenum on the acceleration of scientific and technical progress and the extensive application of scientific achievements in production. The contribution of cosmonautics is not limited to the results of scientific research or the unique information it provides on the earth and the universe. Space industry itself is acquiring valuable information. This is a capital which will bring returns in the form of new ideas, work principles and technological processes.

III

The role of contemporary cosmonautics is not limited to the solution of individually applied science problems. The methodological and engineering-technological achievements in the leading technological sectors are being made available to industry at large. The Central Committee accountability report to the 26th CPSU Congress noted that "it would probably be worth it... to assess the scientific and design base of the various sectors and submit suggestions on some regrouping of scientific effort. We have the right to rely here on the help of sectors with a particularly strong scientific base...."

The space complexes are a separate type of complex technical systems. The space vehicles themselves are merely "the tip of the iceberg." Most of the outlays are for equipment which ensures the development, testing, required level of reliability, launching and operation processes. More than four-fifths of the entire cost is for ground systems. The development of space technology is based on new ideas, physical principles and technological processes. The development, production and operation of space equipment is becoming a kind of sounding on the basis of which the principles of future machine building are being shaped. Valuable experience is acquired on the organizational, scientific and design-technological levels which, applied in many fields of science, technology and the national economy as a whole, could be extensively used with increasing efficiency.

The structural-technological experience of cosmonautics has the most obvious and extensive application in related or even quite distant technological areas. Space technology, with its strict requirements regarding strength, durability and weight limitations and extreme operational conditions, required the development of a number of new technological processes (plasma powder, new welding and soldering methods, chemical machining, and so on). It was among the first to undertake the development of composition materials, beryllium, insulation materials, screen-vacuum heat insulation and heat-resistant alloys based on molybdenum and myobium. Structures reaching working temperatures in excess of 2,000 degrees centigrade and pressures in the hundreds of atmospheres were developed. The list could be extended ad infinitum.

The development of each new instrument was paralleled by the appearance of dozens or hundreds of inventions which, by virtue of a number of reasons are not being used extensively. Although engaged in the development of one-of-a-kind systems and individual machine units and meeting outer space standards,

as a rule the designer does not take the next minor yet logical step--the study of their applicability in the national economy. Frequently space design and technology lack the scale of application which, considering the high costs, would yield real and tangible economic results. The study of innovations on the scale of the national economy would be a radical solution to this problem. This is the obvious solution to problems related to the use of hydrogen as fuel and energy carrier, the extensive use of new sources of energy--solar, isotope batteries and heat elements--and so on.

The achievements of the space industry must be made available to the rest of the industry. The development of technologies for the production of modular sections would help to develop in the national economy large-scale hermetically sealed containers for storing gases, liquids and loose materials. The extensive use of liquid oxygen as fuel component would greatly advance the development of cryogenic technology and resolve the most important problem of the transportation and lengthy storage of cooled cryogenic fuels virtually loss-free. The principles governing the work and structural development of a soft-landing system of manned space apparatus could be used in the development of various systems for landing heavy freight.

Possibilities offered by such developments are inexhaustible. Starting with the highly reliable elements of cryogenic and vacuum technology, the space industry would enable us to produce a "consumer good" such as advanced robots-manipulators, a type of as yet unseen submersible and underground apparatus and automated systems for meteorological, navigational, geological survey and other economic objectives, which could operate for decades.

It would be difficult to overestimate the scientific experience gained in space industrial output. The design engineers, technologists and testers faced a "scientific virgin land." A number of space achievements infinitely broadened the framework of their application. Suffice it to mention the currently particularly topical problem of ensuring the high reliability of items. Improving reliability and developing a methodology and technology for ensuring high reliability is a strategic line in the intensive development of any type of modern production.

The development of space technology directly related to these most important characteristics may be divided into three stages. The first space machines were reliable as a result of their structural simplicity and considerations based on the broad range of possible working conditions. The use of the latest equipment and technological processes, strict quality control, mastering space production standards, and ergonomics made it possible to reduce the intensiveness of space equipment element breakdowns on the order of one or two.

The increased complexity of the apparatus and the fast increase in the number of their elements which, by the end of the first decade of the conquest of space, was measured in the hundreds of thousands, called for the intensive development of theories ensuring the high reliability of systems consisting of relatively unreliable elements. The study of work processes on the molecular level, the development of redundancy principles, the extension of the stage of finishing and the corresponding cost increases led to the

development of a second-generation space technology the useful life of which could be measured in terms of years.

Modern self-tuning and self-training space systems with board computers, which analyze and optimize work systems, are the third generation of equipment. Its reliability is not limited to development in tuning on the ground. These are systems which organize themselves in flight. Obviously, this is the way for the development of a wide variety of contemporary machines and the technology of the future.

In analyzing the methodological experience acquired in ensuring the reliability of space systems, we should include the elements of theories which developed on a parallel basis, complementing each other without losing their separate significance.

This applies, to begin with, to the general theory of the correlation between reliability and reserve strength of structures, and the optimizing of the reliability of elements within the established general systemic limitations; secondly, the connection between the dynamics of random work systems and the intensiveness of breakdowns and, on this basis, the development of methods for accelerated testing, accelerated development, selection of "sparing" systems in the rejection and study of the operational performance of flight models; thirdly, the functional connection between reliability and the economic characteristics of the systems and, on this basis, the development of efficient programs for the creation of complex systems.

Naturally, the elements of this theory must be developed individually, in terms of the physics of operational processes and the technology and scale of output of specific machines. However, their field of application is unquestionably broad. The experience of cosmonautics may become the methodological base for ensuring the high reliability and efficiency of a variety of ground technical systems.

Let us recall that the Ural--the first sufficiently powerful Soviet computers --were sent to S. P. Korolev's design bureau and the Baykonur spaceport. One of them, Bearing Plant No. 2, is today in the Cosmodrome Museum, located by that same launching pad No. 2 from which rose the rocket carrying earth's first artificial satellites. We are mentioning this in order to emphasize that cosmonautics has more than a quarter of a century of experience in the mathematical modeling of systems, which is an inseparable part of any design work.

Detailed technical and economic analysis is a structural component of the process of designing a labor-intensive space rocket complex. Compared with ground systems, it has features some of which can be used more extensively. The interconnection of determining structural and operational characteristics and labor outlays at the different development, application and operational stages of the systems is achieved through mathematical modeling. The characteristics of the models are based on the random nature of work processes (random operational conditions, probability of element breakdowns and random structure of functioning systems). The consideration of random factors on the technical and organizational level in technical and economic models of large-scale economic programs, which reflect the real nature of large systems in their dynamics, is a fruitful direction in technical and economic analysis,

which enables us to reliably forecast the efficiency of programs of various kinds.

The organizational experience of cosmonautics is particularly valuable today, when comprehensive state programs are the main task of the five-year plan. We know that one of the main contemporary programs for the development of progressive technology and industrial construction methods includes nearly 3,000 assignments involving 650 co-performing collectives in enterprises managed by several ministries. The Vostok program for the creation of a space rocket complex, which made the flight of Yu. A. Gagarin possible, and which combined the efforts of 25 ministries and departments, was of a similar scale as early as the end of the 1950s. It was precisely then that the organizational principles and forms of joint work by large scientific and production organizations, united on the basis of a single target program, were laid. A leading scientific and technical organ was established--the Council of Chief Designers; forms of dynamic interaction among ministries and leading and related organizations and principles governing the distribution of resources based on the novelty, complexity, labor-intensiveness and the level of reliability of the elements within the single complex were defined. The principles of interaction among design-engineering and testing services, on the one hand, and production and operational services, on the other, were laid. Most important proportions were developed among scientific workers, engineers, technicians, servicing personnel and design, testing and production capacities. The Council of Chief Designers, which consisted of major scientists and heads of ministries, departments and leading enterprises, was not organized on a legal basis. However, its decisions became the law for all participants in this development, regardless of departmental affiliation. The prestige of the council ensured the unity of scientific-technical and administrative policy. As a rule, the separation of such functions in a managing organ leads to sterile efforts or unjustified outlays. The system of having a head organization, structured on the basis of the functional-topical principle, proved essential. It is characterized by the parallel development of a number of programs by collectives with complementing skills. It would be expedient to make use of this experience in the development of complex "ground" systems in scientific-production associations.

Academician S. P. Korolev was not only the creator of a series of one-of-a-kind space rocket complexes but one of the co-authors of the socioproduction principles for the elaboration of new systems on a national scale. This fundamental methodological and practical accomplishment is directly related to the development of cosmonautics.

The skilled design collectives, the deep scientific traditions in cosmonautics, the technical base for designing and the technology for the development of complex systems operating under extreme conditions can and must play an invaluable role in determining future overall technological progress. A development impetus in this case would benefit not only related sectors but the space industry itself which, in order to ensure the efficient utilization of new ideas, technologies and structures frequently lacks extensive industrial facilities and which, in resolving its own problems, must enhance the overall level of machine building to that of space standards.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1983

LAOS: THE MATURING OF THE REVOLUTION

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 6, Apr 83 pp 91-102

[Article by V. Kadulin]

[Text] Distant yet close...this precisely is the impression created by People's Democratic Laos, despite the entire dissimilarity between its way of life and our own customs. Here, far from the homeland, the familiar features of the revolutionary youth of the first country of victorious socialism in the world may be recognized gradually but with increasing clarity in the features of the Lao revolution and the complex contemporary realities and current great concerns of a fraternal people.

There is nothing strange in this. It is precisely the victorious October Revolution which is the starting point in the calendar of contemporary revolutions and which marked the beginning of the age of transition from capitalism to socialism on a universal scale. Any revolution worthy of its name matures according to the same laws.

The Transition Formula

The first unified Lao state, which was one of the largest in medieval Indochina, was known as "the country of a million elephants and the white umbrella." In today's Laos live elephants are not a common sight while the umbrella, which was the symbol of royal power for ages, was put by the revolution on an equal basis with other equally prosaic items of daily use. Even without this, however, the Lao People's Democratic Republic (LPDR) has a number of features described as "exotic."

In December, flooded by the hot sun, this "roof of Indochina," as Laos is known to this day, and nine-tenths of whose territory consists of ridges, mountains and plateaus, proves to be even more picturesque in its tropical colors than we imagined it in our snow-covered Moscow. Eagerly absorbing the sounds and colors of the "land of hospitality and goodness," and rare ethnic variety of the population of 3.8 million, we could not fail to think that nine-tenths of the so-called exotic features of the country were synonymous with economic backwardness.

It is precisely this backwardness, inherited from the colonial-feudal regime, which makes particularly urgent but also incredibly difficult the solution of the problems formulated in the political program of the LPRP [Lao People's

Revolutionary Party], which was held in 1972, on the eve of the victorious completion of the national democratic revolution: "To prepare all the necessary conditions for a direct conversion from socialism, bypassing the capitalist stage of development."

Laos, which is almost the size of Great Britain and slightly less than that of France, was considered among the poorest countries in the world according to United Nations classification. Let us recall, however, that it is precisely Britain and France who were competing in the 19th century on the Indochinese Peninsula in an effort to grab the larger and fatter piece of the colonial pie. To this day the people of Laos are paying dearly for French capitalism which threw its weight around and which was distinguished by its usurious method of colonial exploitation, which was distinguished by insignificant investments in the local economy, a refined system of direct and indirect taxation and preservation of the precapitalist economic system.

It will take the Lao people a lot more time to erase the consequences of the occupation of its land by U.S. imperialism, which hastened to take the place of the French colonizers expelled from the Indochinese Peninsula in the mid-1950s. The imposition of "economic aid" to Laos, which was hardly dictated by humane considerations but, rather, the imperial aspirations of the United States in the area, was channeled almost entirely into the military and the police. It only aggravated the social contradictions in the country, and triggered stagnation in the economy, a catastrophic foreign trade imbalance and unrestrained inflation. Imports of overseas commodities had a fatal impact on traditional national economic sectors.

U.S. imperialism and the "special" war which was unleashed in 1964 against the Lao people resulted in the dropping of more than 3 million tons of explosives on this suffering land--1,000 kilograms per capita. In the course of this bandit war more than one-third of the country's arable land was abandoned, the major highways and the few bridges and irrigation canals were put out of commission; 800,000 people became refugees with no permanent housing or jobs.

This, most briefly, is the "Lao chapter" in the crimes committed by imperialism against mankind. It clearly shows the main reasons for the difficulties currently experienced by the young republic.

The LPDR, which was founded on 2 December 1975, entered its transitional period under conditions of virtually a total lack of material prerequisites for socialism, prepared under capitalism with the steady socialization of labor and the creation of a large-scale and scientifically and technologically most modern machine output. The working class, employed in the few small industrial enterprises, accounts for an insignificant minority of the population.

A visitor to the LPDR can see particularly the extent to which the successful development of the internal prerequisites for a direct transition to socialism is facilitated by the existence of strong international prerequisites. History put the Lao revolution in close touch with the world socialist system

and the Soviet Union. Laos is linked with its closest neighbors--Vietnam and Kampuchea--with particularly strong fraternal ties developed in the course of the long joint struggle for national and social liberation. In building the material prerequisites for socialism, the republic can rely on the economic and defense potential of the members of the socialist comity, their collective experience and their selfless aid and support.

Taking into consideration the general laws governing the development of the socialist revolution and the country's specific conditions, the fourth LPRP Central Committee Plenum, which was held in 1977, defined the course and tasks of the transitional period as follows: "implementation and strengthening of proletarian dictatorship; exercise and expansion of the rights of the working people as the collective owners of the country; the simultaneous implementation of three revolutions: in the field of production relations, in science and technology and in ideology and culture. In this case the scientific and technical revolution plays the key role while the cultural-ideological revolution must be one step ahead of the others."

This course became the base for the 1978-1980 3-year national economic development plan. The "Basic Directions in the Economic and Social Development of the LPDR in 1981-1985," approved in 1980, was the first stage in the long-term socialist construction program. The program's main target is to accelerate the growth rates of public production and the implementation of social changes which ensure the improved well-being of the working people. The forms and methods of economic management will be radically changed. Material, financial and manpower resources will be used more efficiently; the structure of material production will be improved and conditions will be provided to undertake industrialization and agricultural mechanization.

The results of the efforts to create prerequisites for a direct transition to socialism, summed up in April 1982 at the first legal Third LPRP Congress, are impressive.

In the first 6 years of the existence of the people's democratic system the gross national product increased by 43 percent, while the national per capita income increased by nearly 40 percent. Gross agricultural and forestry output increased by approximately one-half. During the first year of the five-year plan gross rice production totaled 1,154,000 tons compared with 700,000 tons in 1976; cattle herds increased by 900,000 head, reaching 1.3 million. The amount of agricultural machinery quintupled. Within those 6 years production capacities were expanded in industry as well. The length of automotive roads was increased by 600 kilometers. The republic created 31 state and forest farms and a cooperative movement developed. Considerable progress was achieved in the areas of culture, education and health care.

These successes are inseparably related to the LPRP, its increased leading role in society and the expansion of its ranks. A permanent theme in Laos is to strengthen and solidify the party and the people's organs even further and to increase their influence on all sides of social life.

"Soon after the Communist Party of Indochina was disbanded in 1956," Khamma Phomkon, deputy head of the propaganda and agitation department of the LPRP Central Committee, said, "our party numbered no more than 400 members. By its second congress, which was held in 1972, the party had 21,000 members. Today it numbers more than 35,000. However, it is not merely a matter of the smallness of party ranks. Armed with the scientific ideology of the working class, and firmly standing on the principles of Marxism-Leninism, the LPRP was born and developed in a peasant country in which the working class is currently only developing, for which reason most of its members are of peasant origin. Following the liberation of the country the party has taken measures to increase the worker stratum and the members of the intelligentsia within its ranks which, however, remain small.

"The party pays great attention to the training of new and 'old' party members and to increasing the number of party members in the primary organizations. In the 7 years which have followed the victory of the people's democratic revolution local party membership has more than tripled and the number of cadre workers has quintupled.

"Today each of the country's 13 provinces has a party committee and party organizations in town and country. However, there are no party organizations in many districts. Our task is to set up party organizations in all primary administrative units by 1985.

"A clear distinction must be made between the structures and functions of party committees and people's-administrative committees. So far we have no law clearly defining the organization, work, rights and obligations of the people's authority. Without waiting for a law to be passed, we must reorganize and improve the work of the administrative committees. The party pays great attention to the further construction and strengthening of the mass organizations. The first youth congress, to be followed by congresses of trade unions and women's organizations, will be held in the near future.

"Most of all," our collocutor emphasizes, "we must make our party 'monolithic in will and action'..."

What makes the creation of such a party even more necessary is the fact that despite its successes, as the Third Congress noted, the country is at the very beginning of the transitional period. Yet, as Comrade Kayson from Phomvihan, the leader of the Lao communists, emphasized at the congress, the path to socialism in a country in which a petty marketable economy and autarchic barter farming predominate, lies through a number of transitional stages, for which reason it will be lengthy and exceptionally hard.

The originality of the ways and means for resolving the problems of the transitional period is manifested in Laos quite unexpectedly sometimes. Vientiane, the Lao capital, wakes up to the loud crowing of roosters. As we determined in the course of the trip, they are as loud in other cities. Other kinds of livestock are equally at ease on city streets. They are bred by the families of workers, journalists, party workers, and government employees. In this case the main occupation or position is totally inconsequential. The Lao

friends make no secret of the fact that the nominal wages of all working people categories are quite low and that the private auxiliary farms in which vegetables are grown and chickens raised are vitally necessary today. The products go to supplement the family meals while the surplus is sold on the market, thus adding to the food resources. That is why the people's regime encourages and, to the extent of its possibilities, helps the development of the private auxiliary plots, considering them a structural part of the socialist system.

After the victory of the people's democratic revolution, the state nationalized all banks and large enterprises which belonged to the previous administration as well as the private enterprises whose owners had escaped abroad. It took over control of finances, electric and water power supplies, the information and communications media, the press, radio broadcasting, the largest printing presses and the entire public education system.

People's Democratic Laos gives preference today to the development of the state and cooperative economic sectors so that they may assume a leading role and, subsequently, a dominating position in the national economy. However, as they encourage production, the party and the state rely on all five actually existing systems in the country.

The Lao marketplace, whether in the capital or in a provincial center, clearly shows the clash among the transitional forms and their confrontation triggered by the mixed national economy. The generous gifts of the land, half of which have simply no Russian equivalent, is clearly confirmed by the significant fact that starting with 1980 the republic was able essentially to resolve the problem of the supply of the nation with food.

The marketplace offers nails, medicines, hoes, soap, products of the local craftsmen and Japanese radio engineering, fabrics, bottled gasoline, which is extremely scarce, knitted goods, shoes and toys. That is how it participates in the organization of an extensive trade between agriculture and industry in a country in which barter and petty commodity production predominate. Sales have increased considerably partly because of the lively markets.

However, the marketplace is the lair of the private producer. While encouraging trade, he inevitably introduces in the new life the ways, means and mores of the petty owner. This comes to mind when we see on his stand goods which have clearly "lost their way" between the state warehouse and the state store. However, there are few state retail trade enterprises--less than 200. Profiting from this situation, the private merchant raises his food and durable good prices and undermines the value of the kip, the national currency.

The people's system has called for substantially restricting the activities of private merchants on the domestic market through the development of state and cooperative trade. That is why, as was once the case in the young Soviet Republic, the party's slogan "Learn to trade!" is so persistently heard in People's Democratic Laos. However, in order to trade and organize the exchange of goods, the old narrow roads linking the country's provinces and districts must be reconstructed and new roads built to facilitate international

haulage. Marketability of agricultural output must be substantially increased as of now and the volume of industrial output increased substantially.

View From the Dam

A splendid view of the reservoir and the blue mountain ridges bordering the Vientiane valley opens from the top of the Namngum hydroelectric power plant. It also lets us see the country's present and future.

Here, at the station, one cannot escape the thought that People's Democratic Laos will need time to convert to socialism on the basis of electrification. As Lenin said, this conversion will also require "intermediary links," which the republic is researching today.

For example, to this effect the country must greatly increase the number of engineers such as Sombun Manolom, a graduate of the Donetsk Polytechnical Institute, who discusses at great length the life of the plant's collective. This Lao power-generating enterprise employs no more than 197 people, half of whom are technicians. These most progressive members of the as yet developing working class in the country have been trained in large-scale machine production and acquired a solid class political training. In order for Laos to have a socialist future all 15,000 workers currently employed at 188 state industrial enterprises must undergo technical and political training; the same applies to approximately the same number of their class comrades employed at other Lao enterprises.

It was here, at the dispatcher station equipped with advanced electronic systems, that we recalled as a contrast the visit we had paid the previous day to the Vientiane clothing factory, which could be described more accurately as a factory for artistic goods. The factory has substantially expanded since the time that its owner and some of the specialists fled the country--from 30 to 142 people. Most of the workers are yesterday's peasant women, whom I saw in an open-air hall behind weaving looms of a kind found in any peasant home.

Although they are most skillful masters of their work and with all due respect, they could not be classified as yet as members of a modern working class in the full meaning of the term. And what about those who work at extremely small enterprises in which petty artisan production and manual labor predominate and which employ from three to 25 people!

The two second-stage turbines, which were commissioned in 1978, increased the capacity of the Nomngun station from 30,000 to 110,000 kilowatts. The fifth turbine will be installed in 1984, increasing the plant's power to 150,000 kilowatts. The station generates 800 million kilowatt hours of electric power, or 90 percent of the country's overall annual output. Income from the sale of electric power generated at the Nomngun GES to neighboring Thailand, which reached almost \$20 million in 1982 as a result of new, more equitable prices, is so far one of the main sources of foreign currency income which the republic urgently needs.

However, the current ratio between the amount of energy generated and consumed in the country, as it was inherited from the past, is becoming increasingly intolerable today and will be inconceivable in the future. The day will soon come when cables will be laid leading to the Vientiane valley and the turbines of the Nomngun GES will bring electric light to the peasant homes. The country has already begun the implementation of the stipulation adopted at the Third Party Congress on preparing for the construction of medium- and large-scale power projects which will supply electric power to industry and the consumers and, in the final account, renovate the country's socioeconomic aspect.

"Our republic has large reserves of hydraulic power resources," said Khamoun Boupha, first deputy minister of industry, handicrafts and forestry. "Our subsoil is rich in minerals. We are partially exploiting previously discovered deposits of manganese, coal and tin. The discovery of new deposits in the republic is not excluded. After the republic was proclaimed we undertook to make an inventory of our natural resources. The Soviet Union is helping us extensively in this project. However, most resources remain unused as yet...."

A map of natural resources will be charted with the help of Soviet geologists, which will identify the location of Lao industry and will help to determine the development of industrialization more accurately. I could understand the pride of my collocutor when he enumerated the industrial enterprises which were completed under the people's regime. There were several dozen of them, including a plan for zinc-lined roofing iron, a tobacco factory, washing detergent and soap plants, a factory for mixed feed and vaccines, and workshops for agricultural equipment repairs.

I could hardly keep up with jotting down the figures on the high rates of growth of industrial output achieved during the second year of the five-year plan. The deputy minister pointed out, however, that by far not all Lao industry sectors are fulfilling their production plans and that some enterprises work at half or even one-quarter capacity because of systematic breakdowns in raw material, material and fuel supplies.

In today's Laos agriculture and forestry are the foundations of the national economy. Taking the country's specific conditions into consideration, the party took a course of priority development of these economic sectors in order to create an initial accumulation fund needed for industrialization and for improving the people's living conditions. Laos has 12 million hectares in timber, consisting mostly of valuable species and up to 200-300-year-old trees. Together with tin, timber will become the biggest item in Laotian exports.

The party's Central Committee and the government have called for organizing comprehensive work in forestry, from the collection of seeds, tree planting and preservation and gradual limitation in this connection of farming by felling and burning trees to processing the timber and marketing the finished goods. The country has set up forestry farms which did not exist under the old system. Nine of them are under the direct jurisdiction of the Ministry

of Industry, Handicrafts and Forestry, which also runs the largest 14 out of the 100 sawing mills and timber-processing enterprises in the country which are under provincial administration.

This industrial sector is developing rapidly. New production capacities are built and older ones reconstructed. The overall volume of timber milling and processing is increasing steadily. Thus, for example, in the area of national Highway No. 9, which runs from Savannakhet, the center of Savannakhet Province to Vietnam, a sawmill with a capacity of up to 30,000 cubic meters per year was built with the help of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam.

The timber-processing combine in Vientiane was completed at the end of 1980. The combine produces tables, chairs, beds and other household items. As a result of mastering new types of output, the 1982 enterprise production plan was more than quadrupled compared with 1981. The combine could increase its volume of output and work even more successfully but, as our conversation with Comrade Bounmi, its deputy director, revealed, it is short of raw materials.

It turns out that the Vientiane plywood factory, which employs some 400 people, has the same problem in timber-rich Laos. Here again the output is increasing rapidly. Four-fifths of the goods are exported to the USSR and the other members of the socialist comity.

Raw material shortages are not the only difficulty which complicates the life of the collective. According to Mouan Simonkhott, the factory's director, there are electric power, material and spare part shortages. The enterprise's normal production activities are hindered also by the lack of productive and working capital. Finally, the lack of labor legislation hinders the work.

Breakdowns in raw material supplies, the director explains, are related to the lack of timber-hauling tracks and automotive transportation idling caused by fuel shortages. The lack of roads hinders the transportation of petroleum products which the Soviet Union delivers to Vietnamese ports. However, Route No. 9, which was totally wrecked during the war, is being reconstructed. Laos is being helped by construction workers from the socialist countries. A petroleum pipeline is being laid with USSR help, along which such greatly needed fuel will be supplied to the republic.

Concerned with the first shoots of socialized labor, the state is intensifying its control over the economic activities of the private sector. Such control is particularly necessary today, Khmuouan Boupha emphasized, citing as an example the machinations of an exposed owner of a rather large enterprise who, profiting from lack of control, was stealing from the state. Although earning a profit, his accounts showed that he was working at a loss, as a result of which he was receiving state loans which he had no intention of repaying.

During our trip in the country we heard used particularly frequently the word "reorganization." A radical restructuring of the country's management system

was undertaken in 1982. The reorganization of the republic's state plan and the establishment of ministries of construction, material and technical procurements and transportation and communications and the establishment of a party-state control committee are related to strengthening planning in economic management and organizing Leninist-style state accountability and control. Scientific and technical councils were set up by the ministries. The principle of one-man command and personal responsibility for assignments on the part of managers on all levels is being strengthened and the administrative apparatus is being reduced. In the final account, my collocutors emphasized, it is a question of strengthening a social system in which the state administers, the party manages and the people are the collective owner.

Shoots of Collectivism

The sinister and pretentiously stupid monument to the feudal past dominates Pakse, capital city of Champassak Province. It is a tall, huge palace built by Prince Boun Oum, who only yesterday was the biggest landowner in the southern part of Laos. The prince fled from the revolution without being able to complete his palace and, in the final account, ignominiously ended his life in exile. Meanwhile, the people's regime has neither the time nor the capability of turning this huge concrete box into a hotel or administrative center.

The city and the province lead a tranquil life, although curfew is still imposed in Pakse and one is likely to find in the Champassak countryside groups of armed peasants of a local self-defense detachment. In the wake of Boun Oum other feudal lords with their retinues fled the province. Occasionally bandits they equip cross the bank of the Mekong, kill members of the people's army and civilians and plunder peasant homes. The border with fraternal Kampuchea is also restless, as the unfinished Pol Pot supporters are still operating there. Therefore, the twin task of defending the homeland and building socialism is exceptionally topical.

Despite the droughts and floods which literally tested the people's system's firmness as the rest of the country, starting in 1980 the province has been able to support itself with food. In 1981 it produced more than 400 kilograms of paddy rice per capita or nearly 100 kilograms above the national average. That same year it sold 10,000 tons of rice to the state. It is deservedly known as the country's rice granary.

"We are currently engaged in the dissemination and practical implementation of the decisions of our Third Party Congress," said Tongin Thamakod, deputy secretary of the provincial party committee and chairman of the province's people's-administrative committee. "We are raising the peasantry to defend the province, struggle for production upsurge and the development of cooperatives. We well realize that agriculture is the base for economic development. We know that backward production relations are hindering the development of production forces. However, the way from theory to practice is long and hard..."

We cross a village along the first...the fourth...the 42nd kilometer. On either side of the road leading to the Boloven plateau, 1,200 meters above sea level, stand peasant homes made of the ubiquitous bamboo, on poles high above the ground and with a mandatory verandah. With increasing frequency we see along the sides of the road richly colored piles of capsicum, piled directly on the ground, side-by-side with squares of yellow, orange or blue beads of coffee drying in the sun. With increasing frequency we notice the craters left from the last war.

To this day people are being killed by mines and bombs buried in the ground from that time. However, nothing can kill the shoots of the new life which are emerging with increasing confidence on this suffering land prepared by nature itself for peaceful toil.

Also returning to the land is the peasant Tompai Sourinthon, whom we met at Phou Mak Nao, which is the administrative center of State Farm "08" he heads. The name, I was told, is in honor of the party directive which was issued under this number marking the beginning of mass cooperativization in the Lao countryside. The state farm employs 462 people. They consist of military personnel not above corporal rank, policemen, officials of the regime overthrown by the revolution and their families. Only yesterday battalion commissar Tompai Sourinthon, who had managed to fight the French and the Americans, and his subordinates were on different sides of the front line. Today they are building the new Laos together.

As everywhere else, here one must begin virtually from scratch. The war, the American bombs and American canned coffee undermine local production at its foundations. One must begin with means on hand. Available equipment may be numbered on one's fingertips. The state farm has no specialists such as mechanics or veterinarians. It does not have an agronomist or a professional bookkeeper. The director himself has no more than a grammar school education. Inexperience in labor organization is revealed at every step.

Despite all of these negative features, State Farm "08" is increasing its volume of output and organizing collective life. It has 226.5 hectares in coffee, in which all of its seven departments specialize. It also has land in tea and cinchona trees. The state farm has undertaken to grow potatoes, which is a new crop for Laos. In December it was still too early to estimate the coffee crop, which is harvested at different times depending on the age of the trees. However, the state farm is hoping to pick more than 30 tons and thus considerably to overfulfill its plan. The first saplings have already been planted at its section on kilometer 42. The public herd grazing on the plateau totals 538 cows, 102 buffalo, eight horses and two elephants. The elephants, which I was unable to see, are irreplaceable here. They are good for work in the jungle and during the rainy season it is only through them that the state farm can remain in touch with the outside world.

However, the outside world itself is knocking at Boloven's doors. After leaving the state farm, a few minutes later we were in Paksong, the district administrative center, where my fellow travelers pointed out a newly built frame house. Here, they said, will live specialists from the Soviet Union

and, not far from them, specialists from the GDR. With their help studies have already been undertaken for the location of future plantations, for according to estimates, they could cover 300,000 hectares on the plateau. So far, the area in coffee plantations does not exceed 10,000. Studies are under way for the building of power plants, the systems of which will turn a new page in the life of Boloven and its surroundings. Warehouses for coffee storing and grading will be built on the mountain slopes at an altitude of 500 to 600 meters above sea level. The microclimate will make it possible to avoid the use of technically complex and, therefore, expensive storage areas. A coffee-felling machine has been built with GDR help. This was followed by a plant for the processing and production of finished goods. Already now, however, consumer goods are reaching the country in exchange for Lao coffee.

I was told by Olod Chounlamounti, deputy minister of agriculture, irrigation and cooperatives, that a commission has been set up in the republic on the further development of coffee production. Currently the average coffee crop is 700 kilograms per hectare; the use of contemporary industrial technology would make it possible to obtain 2 to 3 tons per hectare. Increased coffee exports would upgrade the marketability of Laotian agriculture. The only way to achieve this is through the unification of the small private plantations into big cooperative ones. Only thus could modern machinery be used and highly productive labor organized. It is also only thus that the patriarchal way of life of the Lao countryside could be changed and three revolutions made simultaneously.

The peasant girls in Sang Khien, which is on the side of the Boloven plateau in the Mekong valley, on the left bank of the river some 15 kilometers from Champassak, have also undertaken to reorganize their life on a collectivistic basis. The cooperative farm, which was set up in 1978 here, includes 30 families, we were told by Si Ounchyan, an elderly farmer and father of 14 children, the chairman of the cooperative. In setting up the farm, the peasants decided to combine their land plots and their draft animals. The cooperative has 64.5 hectares in rice fields. The work is done by two brigades of 15 families each.

Labor is recorded in points. The rating system is quite simple and understood by everyone. For example, a farmer who has plowed 2,000 square meters in a single day has achieved excellent results and has earned 20 points. The plowing of 1,500 meters rates 15 points and 1,000 meters, 10. If a brigade member were to plow 3 hectares per month he is awarded 300 points or the equivalent of 30 work days. The points include a work quality rating as well. An excellent monthly norm is rated 300 points; average quality work is 150 points and poor work is awarded no points. In 1981 the cooperative harvested approximately 100 tons of rice. Its tax to the state was 90 kilograms per hectare or 10 kilograms less than charged the private farmers. A seed stock was set aside. The rest was distributed. Let us point out here that in settling accounts the size of the contributed land is taken into consideration through the addition of points. Those who have contributed to the farm a strong bullock are also given a regular 300-point "bonus." Rice to nonworking family members--children and the aged--is allocated on the basis of a jointly accepted norm. Therefore, everyone has enough rice, notes

the chairman, or if more is needed it could be purchased from the farm. Any surplus is sold to the state on the basis of fixed purchase prices. In turn, the state supplies the farm with land protection chemicals and also supplied the farm with a mini-tractor. This was the first and, therefore, the most precious harbinger of a technical spring delayed for decades in the eyes of the peasants of Sang Khien village. Everyone was waiting for it, for cooperative farming demands the extensive use of machinery. This was made quite clear at the cooperative threshing floor: elderly women, the chairman and his young daughters, each holding two bamboo sticks connected with a leather strip were beating at the sheaves of rice on boards laid on the ground, where the heavier grain remained.

In terms of the level reached in the socialization of productive capital, labor organization and wages and nature of economic activities, which no longer consist merely of ensuring the self-support of their members with food, the cooperative farm in Sang Khien village may be considered a superior form of cooperation. In today's Laos there usually are three forms of cooperatives. However, they are so flexible that any effort at classification becomes quite arbitrary.

Groups jointly farming the land, resuming under the new conditions the traditions of mutual aid which have existed in the Lao countryside for ages, are at the bottom of the ladder. The people join such groups to help one another to plow a field or harvest the crop. However, the crop belongs to the owner of the land. In other associations the peasants can socialize only the land or the cattle and farm implements; in others again, as in Sang Khien, as a rule, all productive capital is socialized.

"We are thankful to those who give the land to the cooperative and, naturally, we do not hurt in the least those who retain the right of land ownership," said Tongin Thamakod. "The founders of the cooperative must resolve this on a voluntary basis, depending on the level of their consciousness and real possibilities. Our strategic objective is to socialize productive capital. However, the people must be persuaded of the need to do this. We can cause only harm by hastening this process."

Champassak Province had 428 cooperatives at the end of 1982. When a broad cooperativization movement was mounted in 1978 by party decision, there were more than 476. However, the instability of the cooperativization process is to be blamed not only on haste or insufficient experience. What complicates matters is the mass shifting of the peasants and the weakness of the initial material and technical base of the cooperatives, which so far has received little help from the state.

Last year the elaboration of an extensive long-term peasant cooperation program was undertaken in the country, where 1,700 cooperative farms existed at that time. The program was to take into consideration experience acquired in previous years and that of the fraternal socialist countries.

The Secret of Freedom

"The secret of freedom," Maximilien Robespierre wrote, "is to educate the people in the same way that the secret of tyranny is to keep them in ignorance." The French bourgeois, the direct heirs of those who sent to the guillotine the greatest hero of the revolution, preferred the second solution at the periphery of their colonial possessions.

On the eve of the victory of the national democratic revolution 90 percent of the Lao people were totally illiterate. The country had no single higher educational institution and only 17 percent of all children went to school.

"The main problem of the cultural revolution," says Sisana Sisan, minister of culture, "is the shaping of the new person. This means that he must be educated above all. Under Lao conditions one of the most important tasks of the cultural revolution is to eliminate petit bourgeois consciousness and religious and all other prejudices and obsolete traditions which prevent us from building socialism. We must put an end to illiteracy. We must create, train and educate new cadres, including a technical intelligentsia. Only under such circumstances could we accomplish a change in production forces and production relations...."

The secret of freedom is to educate the people... During the 7 years of existence of the republic, the people's system has virtually eliminated illiteracy in seven out of 13 provinces and in three others has come very close to the solution to this task of primary significance. As was noted at the Third LPRP Congress, today 85 percent of the population can read and write. The campaign for the elimination of illiteracy, this shameful legacy of the past, will be completed in the immediate future.

The people's regime has entirely reorganized the school education system. The conversion of training on all levels in Lao was a major victory. The number of school students in the country virtually doubled. National cadres have been and are being trained by two institutes--pedagogical and medical--and by vocational technical schools in several provinces. Today more than 10,000 young citizens are studying abroad. In present-day Laos most students are the offspring of the toiling people.

The groups of school students along Vientiane's streets and along provincial roads, boys running after a soccer ball on the grass on the edge of the schools and under the windows of the cottages of absent feudal lords, now used as school buildings, are mandatory and perhaps the most picturesque and vivid details of the Lao landscape.

However, is it too early to say that the education of the people has been accomplished? Mandatory primary education has yet to be introduced in the republic among all Lao nationalities. Within the shortest possible time the network of vocational schools, secondary specialized schools and VUZs must be streamlined and expanded in order to reduce the shortage of specialists and skilled workers in mass professions. The material and technical base of the schools must be strengthened and the quality of training upgraded. The shortage of teachers and textbooks, including in the social disciplines, must be eliminated as well.

The secret of freedom is to educate the people.... I asked the minister of education, sports, physical education and fine arts about work among the national minorities inhabiting the distant mountainous parts of the country.

"This is a difficult problem," Sisana Sisan answered. "As we know, some 70 different tribes and ethnic groups speaking different languages inhabit the country. After the revolution boarding schools were set up in each provincial center for the children of the national minorities. We are also building schools in the native areas of these minorities, wherever possibilities exist to this effect. The point is that the mountain tribes use a tree-cutting and burning farming method. After exhausting the parts of the jungle they have plowed, usually every 3 years they find a new location. We are trying to settle the mountain tribes and encourage them to abandon the cutting and burning farming method which, in addition to everything else, is greatly harming the forests--our national wealth."

"Convincing the people of the need for their children to learn does not apply to the members of small ethnic groups alone. Most stupid prejudices survive among the mountain populations. True, they are disappearing although slowly. Today the children of the Laoteng and Laosung are developing as skilled specialists. So far they are few but we shall do everything possible to increase their number."

Cone-shaped Lao temples, reflecting the cosmogonic concepts of Buddhism, stand filled with age-old secrets. We see puzzling, silent monks in yellow garb, their heads shaved, locked within themselves. What are the current relations between the people's regime and Buddhism and with the Buddhist religious community--the Sanghoy?

"Before the revolution," Sisana Sisan said, "every Lao man had to spend some time in a monastery. I too spent 7 days there at one point," said the minister smiling. "Seriously speaking, every citizen has the freedom of conscience and belief and the church is separated from the state. To this day no one is forbidden to go to a monastery for a while."

"However, we should bear in mind that the Buddhist community in Laos has its characteristics. During the liberation struggle many monks actively supported the patriots. Most of the Buddhist religious community agrees with the revolution. It even believes that Buddhism is close to socialism and communism in terms of its humane objectives. Through all of these years we have worked among the members of the Buddhist community and tried to involve them in political life and in building the new Laos. This work is yielding results. One could say that the pagoda has become a people's polyclinic and, in many cases, a people's school where the monks educate the children. The members of the religious community are actively participating in the people's holidays. In turn, we have a careful and respectful attitude toward the pagodas and the humane traditions of Buddhism. All in all, the monks have their place in the life of the republic. No particular problems arise in relations between them and the people's system."

"The difficulties currently experienced by the cultural revolution under way in our country," Sisana Sisan said in conclusion, "are those of the transitional period. As in other fields of life, in the realm of culture the new is fighting the old which, in our peasant and backward country, has kept

very deep roots. The developing forms do not always prove to be better than the old. To fight merely with the imposition of bans on alien and harmful customs and vestiges in the mind is impossible. They must be countered by the viable forms of a new culture, national in form and socialist in content...."

The secret of the spiritual liberation for which the people's system is working involves the creation of song and dance groups, a national circus, and music and puppet theaters; professional ensembles in each province and the extensive development of amateur art collectives; 25 motion picture theaters and more than 100 mobile movie projectors; the national movie studio, which has already produced the first full-feature film on the events in the Plaine des Jarres, precious to every patriot; the revolutionary museum in Vientiane and the historical museum in Luang Prabang, the old royal capital.

Every day the 10,000 issues of PASASON ("People"), the LPRP Central Committee organ, spread among the Lao working people the party's truth and describe the world of real and victorious socialism.

The Pakse radio station regularly broadcasts in four languages for the tribes of the three neighboring Champassak, Attappy and Saravan provinces. There is great demand for spiritual nourishment and the personnel of the local state information agency issue a weekly bulletin and are planning the publication of newspapers.

The local journalists, who work under the supervision of the people's administrative provincial committee, have a difficult job. Because of the nature of their work they are hindered by the lack of roads, transportation, and telephone communications with the provincial cities more than others. However, what hinders the most perhaps is their insufficient education and professional training. They are hurrying to study in order to teach others, as the party demands. That is why they gratefully recall that 3-month seminar which their GDR colleagues sponsored for their benefit.

The director of the former royal and now national printing press, Onsi Boutsivongsak, gratefully mentions the young workers who are mastering the complex printing skills in the socialist countries and the technical help which Vietnam and the Soviet Union are providing his collective. Despite all difficulties the press is publishing many hundreds of thousands of copies of books, newspapers and periodicals.

... Old-fashioned "royal" presses were squeaking rheumatically in the narrow premises. Repair workers were clanking bits of iron on the side, it smelled of the glue used to bind periodicals and of fresh printing ink. A youngster in a red shirt, the son of one of the workers, was sleeping on a wide binding table, soundly and carelessly. He was sleeping without realizing that everything around him was being done for him and the sake of his freedom, and that all this was done for the sake of the likes of him, for the sake of the future of the Lao people who had taken the path of the socialist revolution as the collective owner of the beautiful Country of a Million Elephants and the White Umbrella.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1983

5003

CSO: 1802/12

PLANS AND DEEDS OF NEWFANGLED 'CRUSADERS'

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 6, Apr 83 pp 103-113

[Article by Dr of Historical Sciences L. Tolkunov]

[Text] Last year, addressing the British House of Commons, U.S. President Reagan announced the beginning of a new "crusade for freedom." Once again, in his latest speeches, he has described the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries as the "center of evil" which must be fought. The nature and content of such statements by the American President on this topic proved quite clearly the true purposes of said "crusade." They are, as the President himself said, no more and no less than "leaving Marxism-Leninism behind on the ashes of history."

It would be senseless to argue against such malicious, not to say pathological, sallies. Facts are facts: the idea of knocking out not only the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries but the entire world communist movement is being resurrected. Furthermore, the general call for mounting an anticommunist "crusade" conceals broad plans of struggle against the growing democratic and national liberation movements the world over. The right-wing groups, which currently dominate the leading circles in the United States, are charting a course to establish their leadership in the world arena as well. Relying on corresponding reactionary groups in other countries, they try to subordinate to their will the entire capitalist system and direct it to a confrontation with the socialist world and the broad democratic and national liberation movements the world over. The new reactionary "crusade," as was noted at the March 1983 Conference of Secretaries of Central Committees of Communist and Worker Parties of the Socialist Countries on International and Ideological Problems, which was held in Moscow, "are in fact a tool of aggression against the growing forces of peace, democracy and social progress and are aimed at interfering in the domestic affairs of other countries, encouraging hostility in relations among countries and intensifying international tension even further."

I

Clearly seen behind President Reagan's address is the proclaimed intention of U.S. reactionary groups to inaugurate a new, and, as its initiators hope, long-term stage of imperialist policy of an openly aggressive nature. Had the "crusade" been merely one more ideological concept, it would not have been worth much attention. The fact, however, is that this is the state

policy pursued by the leading imperialist state, the common denominator for the political, economic and military confrontation between the two systems on the basis of which the White House is trying to push all members of the non-socialist world. As a whole, the proclaimed "crusade" may be defined as a course directed toward global U.S. intervention activities with a view to undermining real socialism and counteracting all revolutionary and democratic forces of our time with all possible means, including thermonuclear war.

The new global strategy on the "psychological warfare" level conceived by Washington's "crusaders" is the anticommunist strategy of the most aggressive and reactionary circles of American imperialism and an attempt to lay a pseudo-ideological foundation for the imperialist and expansionist policy pursued by the United States in all directions--military-strategic, political and economic. The anticommunist "crusade," which Washington's strategists have raised to the level of state policy, is conceived as a campaign against anyone who rejects its arbitrary policy in international relations. The American ruling upper crust appears to be justifying its claim to world domination as its target and total permissiveness as a means to achieve it through its malicious attacks on the Soviet Union and the socialist world.

On the political level, the "crusade" idea conceals the intention of burying detente once and for all and converting to a policy of open and fierce confrontation with the socialist world. This is expressed in the refusal to discuss with the USSR a number of key problems of normalizing international circumstances in our time, attempts to counteract cooperation between the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries, on the one hand, and the young liberated countries, on the other, by all possible means and the aspiration to weaken the countries of real socialism internally. A signal is being given, so to say, for engaging in a global confrontation between the reactionary capitalist circles and the socialist countries and all progressive forces of our time, the international communist, worker and national liberation movements above all.

Economically, the purpose of the "crusade" is severely to damage the national economic power of the USSR and the other socialist countries through all possible restrictions on exports of modern equipment to the socialist countries, stricter control over credits, and so on. In this area the class enemy is trying most actively and shamelessly to benefit from the economic difficulties encountered by some members of the socialist comity in the course of their progress. Furthermore, it is known that currently all kinds of plans are being formulated for launching an "economic war" against all socialist countries both jointly and separately. The reality of the frequently proclaimed intention, by imposing upon the USSR an arms race, of "exhausting" the Soviet economy is becoming increasingly obvious. However, this objective is as unattainable as it may be attractive to the circles of international monopoly capital.

They would like to extend the "crusade" to the entire military-strategic policy pursued by the United States and its allies. Of late a flood of speeches have been coming out of Washington on the single topic of military preparations and programs and the development of new types of weapons. The

military potential of the United States is expanding at an unrestrained pace and its allies are coerced into participating in the mad arms race, all of this motivated by the desire to gain superiority over the USSR. A variety of steps are being taken to ensure U.S. "preemptive" military readiness. New armament systems are being developed which, as the Pentagon boasts, would be difficult to counter. Unceremonious heavy pressure is being applied on Washington's allies to force them steadily to increase their military power. Persistent efforts are being made to instill in the people ideas of the possible waging of a "limited" nuclear war, in Europe in particular. The simultaneously imposed restrictions on the allies regarding East-West trade are shamelessly used to weaken the competitors of American monopolies in Western Europe and Japan. "In this case," Comrade Yu. V. Andropov noted in answer to the questions asked by a PRAVDA correspondent, "in the effort to substantiate such hegemonic aspirations such shameless distortions of Soviet policy and such dirty means are used that, frankly speaking, the question arises of what are the President's concepts on behavioral standards in dealing with other countries?"

The pursuit of fierce "psychological warfare" against the socialist countries is an inseparable component of the new "crusade." The various levels of the American administration, including senior U.S. officials, the President first of all, are directly involved in propaganda actions. The President is making endless speeches, praising on a virtually daily basis capitalism and slandering communism, socialism, the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries which he labels "totalitarian." The antisocialist propaganda is steadily kept on the highest possible hysterical note and, in order to make it more convincing, a substantial portion of "peace-making" demagogic has been added to dilute it. The new committee on planning foreign policy propaganda on the cabinet level, created with Reagan's directive No 77, appears to be the next step in the organizational development of the "crusade" in the "public or open diplomacy," as the familiar expression used in the American capital goes. Simply stated, American high government officials are becoming increasingly involved in "psychopolitical warfare." An unprecedented escalation of lies and slander of the USSR and real socialism is increasing; the official position taken by our country on important international problems is being grossly distorted; the "free press" is being actively used in efforts to impose upon Western public opinion falsified data on Soviet military preparations, the Kremlin's plans, and so on.

Of late the White House is relying with increasing frankness on broad-scale propaganda-political subversion. This is confirmed, among others, by an entire series of recently organized actions and specific steps with which the authors of "crusade" plans are dreaming of undermining the socialist system in the USSR and the other members of the socialist comity. It was precisely these plans which were the topic of a provocative conference "On Problems of Democratization in the Communist Countries," which the U.S. Department of State convened last October. One month later another propaganda orgy was held, pretentiously described as an "international conference on free choice." Here again the attention was focused on the search for more efficient ways and means for subversive propaganda.

A conference of heads of propaganda services of 56 capitalist countries was held under the aegis of the U.S. Information Agency (USIA), to discuss "new directions in U.S. foreign policy." As was to be expected, the entire "novelty" of these directions was reduced to hints concerning the further broadening of the range and scale of "psychological warfare" waged against the socialist countries and the strengthening of anti-Soviet and anticomunist trends in Washington's foreign policy. These and similar measures, which were described by L. Eagleburger, assistant secretary of state, as "long-term efforts of a global range," led even some Western observers to the conclusion that the American administration is in the grip of a true "ideological fanaticism." Let us add that the fanaticism is not merely ideological.

The "crusade" has been assigned an important domestic policy function as well. In the United States loud talk about it is accompanied by drastic reductions in outlays for social needs and the mounting of an offensive against the rights of the working people. The inflation of anticomunism and chauvinism, and the emphasis on the "external enemy" are, as we know, the favorite imperialist method. It is used today in particular against the antiwar movement in the country and with a view to frightening the American public with the "Soviet menace."

The USIA, the Pentagon, the CIA, the headquarters of the Republican Party, the leadership of the AF of L-CIO and such right-wing organizations as the "American Political Foundation," the "Moral Majority," and others, as well as some private companies and scientific research institutes have been assigned an active role in "crusade"-related measures. Other governmental institutions and public organizations of NATO members and many other countries are also being involved in the "crusade," which is liked by extreme rightist, neo-Nazi and revanchist groups in the United States and Western Europe.

The means and methods used by the "crusade" organizers in their international activities are in strong contradiction with universally accepted norms of international law and the spirit and the letter of the Final Act of the European Conference. "The means to which today's Washington leadership is resorting in order to defame Soviet policy," Comrade Yu. V. Andropov, CPSU Central Committee general secretary, pointed out, "are inadmissible in relations between countries." In violation of the United Nations Charter, the "crusaders" are using the methods of diktat and naked power in politics. They are relying on subverting the foundations of international cooperation in the social, cultural and humanitarian areas. They do not shy from methods such as armed provocations, political murders, subversions, sabotage, bribery and blackmail of political personalities, "black" propaganda, and support of a variety of "fifth columns" and dissident groups.

The question which arises is what is the basis for such a drastic turn toward totally open and frenzied--no other description is possible--anti-Sovietism and anticomunism in the political strategy of American imperialism?

Let us begin by naming the profound objective reasons.

The general crisis in the capitalist system is continuing to worsen. In turn, this increases the social and class tension and the growth of political instability in the capitalist world. The factor of the increased economic power of the USSR and the other Warsaw Pact members, paralleled by their increased defense power, which ensures the strategic balance between the two socioeconomic systems, is also letting itself be known. It is becoming increasingly obvious that the developing countries as well, who are opposing American diktat most firmly, are increasingly blocking a variety of colonialist interventions.

Other factors may be added to such objective reasons. Previous U.S. administrations, including Nixon's and Ford's, proceeded, as we see today, from a compromise between the inevitable recognition of detente and global foreign policy aspirations toward which they were aimed by anticommunism. The Reagan administration, judging by its defenders, has taken the course of "reideologization" of foreign policy, i.e., the restoration of an uncompromising malicious anticommunism, support of reactionary political concepts, restoration of messianic ideas relative to the universal-historical role of the United States and the fanning of chauvinistic and great-power imperial aspirations. In relying on the use of the political immaturity of the broad American public opinion circles, the Reagan propaganda machinery is gambling on the fact that bourgeois propaganda has been able to a certain extent to link in the mass awareness of the Americans the period of detente with that of foreign policy failures on the part of U.S. imperialism, which weakened the global positions of monopoly capital, the growth of crisis phenomena in the country's economy, domestic policy scandals, loss of faith among the voting masses in the government and law and order, and so on. Hence the illusion restored in some ruling U.S. circles and, obviously, encouraged by the "think tanks" of American imperialism on the possibility, as the saying goes, to resolve complex problems in one fell swoop, which monopoly capital is encountering domestically and internationally.

II

The line of undermining the socialist social system wherever it has been established and the illusion that it could be eliminated have always been and remain in the center of the strategic concepts of international and American imperialist foreign policy. The initiators of the new anticommunist "crusade" are clearly forgetting the lessons of history and the failures suffered by their predecessors in similar infamous initiatives.

The first "crusade" was the interventionist campaign which the imperialist countries mounted against the young Soviet republic and the victorious October Revolution. Its organizers, as we know, suffered a crushing and generally unexpected defeat. It was precisely during that difficult period experienced by the land of the soviets that V. I. Lenin drew the conclusion that a nation "in which the majority of workers and peasants have realized, felt and seen that they are defending their own Soviet system--the system of the working people--that they are defending the cause the victory of which will give them and their children the possibility of benefitting from all the goods of culture and everything created through human toil will never be defeated" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 38, p 315).

The imperialists did not abandon the hope of restoring the old order in the Soviet Republic even after the civil war. They mounted an economic blockade and used the most unseemly political means such as conspiracies, subversion, sabotage and terrorism. Naturally, all of this increased the domestic difficulties of the first socialist country. Under incredibly difficult conditions our working class, peasantry and toiling intelligentsia performed a truly historic exploit: they built socialism, they laid a powerful industrial base and greatly strengthened the defense capability of the state of workers and peasants.

During the battles of the Great Patriotic War waged against German fascism and its allies, the Soviet people and their valorous armed forces, led by the CPSU, broke the backbone of the Nazi beast, defended the freedom and independence of their homeland and liberated millions of people in other countries from fascist slavery.

The imperialist politicians erred also when they launched their aggressive war in Korea at the beginning of the 1950s and in Vietnam in the 1960s. The unity of the socialist countries played a decisive role in ensuring the failure of the criminal plans of the imperialist aggressors. Today, when the greatest nuclear powers have a destructive force which, should a military conflict break out, could destroy all life on earth, politicians operating on the national level should remember even more clearly that by engaging in military threats against the forces of socialism and progress in general they are risking not only the fate of their own nations but of all mankind. The high responsibility which they assume with their position demands a sober approach to relations among countries and the thorough and faultless consideration of all determining contemporary factors.

Unless today's supporters of confrontation, increased tension and nuclear arms race are firmly rebuffed, they would be fully capable of driving international relations into a dead-end street which could degenerate into a nuclear war. That is why the concept of "psychological warfare" and, in fact, the balancing on the brink of nuclear war, which is the current aspiration of U.S. militaristic circles and their NATO allies, is so dangerous to the nations.

III

The present stage, in which U.S. imperialism is facing the type of global development realities which undermine its hegemonic intentions, creates a particularly alarming situation in the world. What Washington was carefully concealing in the past is becoming clear today: the imperialist circles have reached a certain point at which their increasing inability to oppose the legitimate changes taking place in the world arena in the course of the historical confrontation between capitalism and socialism is becoming increasingly clear. Looking at the period after World War II, the star of the Soviet Union and the banner of Soviet foreign policy have never been so clear and visible to the world--from the north, south, west and east--as they are today. That is precisely why the main objective of the present "crusade" mounted by the current Washington administration is formulated as a call to

engage in an open struggle with all possible means against the forces of progress and, above all, the socialist comity and the Soviet Union. As the statements and actions of the U.S. leadership indicate, a sort of dress rehearsal of the imperialist "crusade" they are planning and the practical testing of the unseemly methods they have adopted are manifested in their policy toward Poland. According to Washington, it was precisely in this socialist country that the chain reaction of the "breakdown of socialism" should begin. It makes sense, therefore, to recall some details of the role which the "Polish trump" plays in the eyes of U.S. strategists.

For more than 1 year before the Polish authorities imposed martial law, which wrecked the plans of the domestic and foreign counterrevolution, the United States with its Western European partners clamored that the Polish events are exclusively a domestic Polish matter and sternly cautioned against any foreign intervention. Meanwhile, the clandestine Polish underground was being steadily supplied with material facilities in order to continue its subversive activities. This also included "cadres" specially trained in handling such situations by the U.S. and other Western intelligence services. No opportunity was missed to deepen the crisis in the country in the hope of using it for the purpose of overthrowing the socialist system in Poland.

The imposition of martial law in Poland caught the U.S. administration unaware and, for a while, put in a state of shock the services assisting the Polish counterrevolution. However, this was followed by the start of a policy of shameless interference in the domestic affairs of the country, in violation of all norms of international law. After 13 December 1981, when martial law was imposed, essentially not one single week has passed without Washington waving a finger or even a club in the direction of Warsaw or taking anti-Polish actions.

Almost 1.5 years have passed since the republic's State Council ordered the Polish military authorities to secure law and safety in the country. The Polish government, the Sejm, the PZPR and the overwhelming majority of the Polish people dedicated substantial efforts to surmounting the economic and social crisis during that period. Production decline was stopped and a forward movement initiated. Based on the fact that the situation in the country had become essentially normalized, it was decided to lift martial law in Poland at the end of 1982.

At the same time, the scenarios of imperialist conspiracies aimed at separating Poland from the socialist comity were exposed in detail; the mechanisms tying Western subversion centers to counterrevolutionary organizations and extremists hiding in the Polish underground and the reactionary exiles were exposed; the sources of financing of the antisocialist forces were unraveled. According to official data, in the first 10 months of 1982 more than 1,000 pieces of firearms and a number of explosives were confiscated from the criminal elements. A total of 677 clandestine underground groups were made harmless and 360 secret presses and centers for the publication of provocative leaflets and 11 radio stations were detected. All of these "gifts" were received in their time by the antisocialist forces in Poland from the reactionary leadership of the American AF of L-CIO and their European partners related to the intelligence services of the imperialist countries.

The dress rehearsal of the "crusade" against real socialism, which was mounted on Polish ground, and which clearly proved the entire brazenness of the activities of the overseas "crusaders," as was to be expected, brought no glory to its producers. However, as Comrade Yu. V. Andropov, CPSU Central Committee general secretary, emphasized in his report "Sixty Years of USSR," "the imperialists are not abandoning their thoughts of economic warfare against the socialist countries or interference in their internal affairs, in the hope of weakening their social system. They are trying to gain military superiority over the USSR and all members of the socialist comity. Naturally, these plans are doomed to failure. No one can turn back the course of historical development. The attempts to "strangle" socialism failed even when the Soviet state was only beginning to stand on its feet and was the only socialist country in the world. Such efforts are even more futile today."

IV

The plans of the "crusade" organizers and the "global campaign for democracy" are particularly threatening to the developing countries. In an effort to counter the increased revolutionary struggle in the national liberation zone, the ruling U.S. circles are trying to make use of their political and ideological actions as means for increasing their interference in Asian, African and Latin American countries. It is precisely under the cover of such slogans that increased military pressure is being currently applied on revolutionary-democratic forces. In particular, aggressive plans are being formulated and applied toward Nicaragua, Syria, Libya, and Cuba. Washington is encouraging South Africa to mount further military actions against Angola, and Pakistan against Afghanistan; not to mention direct complicity with Israel in its aggression against Lebanon and the unsuccessful attempts to crush the Palestinian resistance movement. Washington's subversive actions against the legitimate Kampuchean government, the slanderous campaign mounted against the Socialist Republic of Vietnam and the uninterrupted aid to the counterrevolutionary gangs in Afghanistan can be described with full justification as structural parts of the "crusade."

An active review of programs for stockpiling strategic raw materials and their accelerated growth was initiated with Reagan's advent to power in the United States. The President delivered to Congress a "plan for a national mineral-raw material program," in which he particularly emphasized that from the U.S. viewpoint "the security of foreign raw material sources (needed by the American industrial machinery--the author) can no longer be ignored." American imperialism is trying to resolve this problem through force, concealed behind considerations on protecting "national security."

The United States has already proclaimed the Middle East, the Persian Gulf and North Africa "vital" areas. Washington approved Israel's invasion of Lebanon in the summer of 1982, and took under its wing the large-scale aggression which the Pretoria racists mounted against Angola in August 1981 and which is continuing to this day. Furthermore, in addition to South Africa, which granted the Pentagon free access to its military bases, no less than 10 countries on the African continent have become sites of permanent locations of various U.S. armed formations capable of engaging in independent

combat operations. Today the United States already keeps abroad more than half a million military personnel in more than 1,500 military bases and sites in 32 countries.

The 200,000-strong police corps of rapid deployment forces, the purpose of which, according to Presidential Directive No 18 of 1977, is "the protection of vital U.S. interests," "interests" which Washington is now claiming to have throughout the world, has become one of the main instruments in U.S. interference in the affairs of developing countries. Washington deems it unnecessary to conceal the fact that, to begin with, such forces are aimed for action in the Middle East and Southwest Asia, essentially in countries adjacent to the Persian Gulf. The Pentagon has undertaken to increase its naval forces in the Indian Ocean with the help of aircraft carriers, landing ships with marines, and floating arms dumps. Strategic bombers have appeared in these areas as well. Ignoring the demand of many countries in the area to convert the Indian Ocean into a zone of peace, the United States drafted a five-year plan for its strategic development (1981-1985), which will cost in excess of \$30 billion. Bases and other military projects are being hastily built in Kenya, Somalia and Oman. The Pentagon is rushing into Pakistan and Saudi Arabia. According to Western estimates, more than 140,000 American military personnel are already stationed in the area of the Indian Ocean. This means that an actual infrastructure for permanent U.S. military presence in this area has been established.

The activities of such forces deployed in the developing countries were reorganized following the establishment of a "central command" (CENTCOM) which was created by Washington on 5 January 1983. The task of the command is to draft plans for "possible operations and military interaction" with allied governments. The "zone of responsibility" covered by the command spreads over the territory of 19 countries, ranging from Pakistan to the east to Egypt to the west and from Jordan to the north to Kenya to the south. Without too much ceremony CENTCOM has also included in its area of activities countries such as Ethiopia and the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen, which have adopted a socialist orientation. Let us also not forget the fact that this "zone of responsibility" includes bases which could be used to strike at the south of the Soviet Union and at the most important sea lanes control of which could blackmail Japan and Western Europe. The result is that any part of the globe in which Washington may consider that suitable conditions have been established for the United States to gain something from the economic-political, not to mention military-strategic, aspects, is proclaimed an area of American "interests." It is stated that such areas must be defended by all means, including the use of military power.

Some individual countries have already become involved in a variety of regional conflicts in the course of pursuing the line of the present U.S. administration of general increase in international tension. They are paying for this with the heavy burden of the arms race which is exhausting their resources and their increased dependence on Washington, the consequence of which is the harm caused to their national sovereignty and their undermined independent policy in global political affairs. Through the lever of military supplies, the United States would like to detach Egypt, Oman, Pakistan,

Somalia and many other countries from the nonaligned movement. At the same time, with the hope of an "escalation of fear," Washington is hoping to paralyze from within the nonaligned movement as an important force in international relations.

"Peace is a product of strength," President Reagan said at his 11 November 1982 press conference. It is precisely such "Pax Americana" that U.S. imperialism is trying to impose upon the developing countries which are taking a socialist orientation.

Last February the Department of State disseminated the so-called "program for democracy and open diplomacy," the entire purpose of which was the even more cynical and gross interference of the United States in the domestic affairs of sovereign countries, including those in Asia, Africa and Latin America which are struggling for their national independence. In addition to the National Security Council, the program was developed with the participation of the CIA and its implementation will be ensured essentially through CIA agents abroad. The Reagan administration is planning to allocate \$65 billion for this program in 1984 alone, as a structural part of even more extensive U.S. propaganda-subversion operations. Such funds will be used to finance abroad activities of pro-American political parties and to bribe mass information media and trade union, religious and other organizations which will be used as Washington's puppets. The training of foreign leading cadres is planned, who would then be able to support and promote American interests in their own countries. The indoctrination of foreign public opinion in a spirit desired by Washington will be carried out intensively at all possible international conferences and meetings.

It is thus that the U.S. government is now openly proclaiming, as an official state concept, its intention to impose American customs, mores and way of life or, rather, disgrace of life on the rest of the world.

V

The "crusade for freedom" unleashed by American imperialism proves once again most clearly the essential nature of American foreign policy, which is aimed at encouraging hostility among nations, an unrestrained arms race and the unification of all reactionary regimes and forces on the basis of a Washington-drafted platform. The U.S. leadership continues to see the world through the lens of confrontation, power and coercive methods as being the most effective in resolving all problems or, in any case, getting the United States out of the historical dead end in which it finds itself. Washington continues to rely on confrontation rather than cooperation and on obstructing the solution of topical problems facing mankind, that of preventing war and strengthening peace above all.

Yes, the present U.S. imperialist policy is a "crusade" against anything that is progressive in the contemporary world. Naturally, this offers nothing essentially new: in the 200 years of its existence as an independent country, as we know, the United States has taken part in more than 200 aggressive wars, as a result of which it nearly doubled its territory at the expense of

its neighbors. In the 20th century alone the American armed forces have been used directly or indirectly in almost 40 armed clashes, the victims of which were many peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America.

In this light words about "freedom" mouthed by the initiators of the new "crusade" are simply sacriligious. No smokescreen can conceal the immorality and antihumaneness of what imperialism, American above all, is undertaking today in the world arena. What could justify the violation of universal norms of international law or the principles of equality, national independence and noninterference in the domestic affairs of other nations? How many delayed-action bombs are hidden behind Washington's efforts to switch the feeling of dissatisfaction with the domestic moral and political situation, increasingly spreading within American society to the entire international community?

The period since Reagan's call for a "crusade" has confirmed with increasing clarity the groundlessness and disparity between the real situation in the world and this pretentious slogan and the final futility of the political course it defines. The very fact that the term "crusade" itself has clearly not been accepted by the overwhelming majority of other Western countries alone is indicative. The numerous difficulties experienced by the American economy, the catastrophic decline in the living standard of the American working people and the aggravation of the social ulcers of American society prove the futility of the efforts made by the apologists of the capitalist system to set the United States as a "model" for other countries and to impose upon their peoples the "American model" of social organization.

The objective circumstances prove that there is no sensible alternative to peaceful coexistence among countries with different social systems and that, sooner or later, Washington will have to take this into consideration. However, even now the struggle against the propaganda premises embedded in the "crusade" slogan is part of the struggle for the prevention of a nuclear war which threatens the very future of mankind. It is no accident that the significant energizing of antiwar actions throughout the world, in Western Europe in particular, has developed as the answer to the plans for a "crusade" and the increasing aggressiveness of American imperialism. Within the United States itself, as we know, public opposition to increased armaments and the aggressive course charted by the White House is growing.

The need to strengthen the defensive strength of the socialist countries, to enhance vigilance and ideological irreconcilability, the creation of an atmosphere of uplift and readiness to rebuff the enemies of socialism is becoming increasingly obvious in the face of the plans for a new anticommunist "crusade." Successes in the economic competition against capitalism are among the best answers to the plans of Washington's "crusaders." That is why new achievements in the economy of the socialist countries and their scientific and technical progress and enhanced labor productivity assume particular importance at this point. Lenin's perspicacious statement to the effect that we are influencing the global revolutionary process essentially through our economic policy sounds particularly relevant today.

The "crusade," which is an orientation toward a developed imperialist offensive, demands of the socialist countries to take new and more effective measures to strengthen their unity and comprehensive cooperation. The Political Declaration of Warsaw Pact Members, which was adopted in Prague at the start of 1983, offers a broad program for joint action aimed at improving the international situation and strengthening the socialist comity further.

As to the immediate effect of Reagan's "crusade," as the TASS statement on this topic emphasized, "the Soviet-leading circles believe that such a policy on the part of Washington is aimed at undermining the foundations of inter-governmental relations and gross interference in the affairs of other countries and represents a major threat to world peace. It requires the sternest possible condemnation."

Unquestionably, the new U.S. propaganda and subversion campaign directed against the forces of socialism, peace and progress, will meet with a crushing rebuff. It will become bankrupt and end its infamous existence on the ash-heap of history--the real one rather than the one on which President Reagan expatiated in the British Parliament.

"... The present U.S. administration," said Comrade Yu. V. Andropov in answering the questions asked by a PRAVDA correspondent, "is continuing to follow an extremely dangerous road. No such thoughtless attitude should be taken concerning problems of war and peace. All efforts to gain military superiority over the USSR are futile. The Soviet Union will never allow this. It will never find itself disarmed in the face of any threat. Let this be clearly realized in Washington. It is time for it to stop inventing increasingly new variants of how better to unleash a nuclear war in the hope of winning it. This occupation is not simply irresponsible but insane."

Socialism has been firmly established over vast areas on our planet. It proved in the past its ability to defend itself against any imperialist intrigues and, at the present stage in its development, it is even more capable of firmly rebuffing any effort at stopping the course of historical progress.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1983

5003

CSO: 1802/12

'HIS ENTIRE SPIRIT TURNED TO THE HOMELAND...'

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 6, Apr 83 pp 114-117

[Review by V. Popov, candidate of philosophical sciences, of the following books on Lenin's life as an expatriate: (1) "Lenin v Finlyandii" [Lenin in Finland] by P. V. Moskovskiy and V. G. Semenov. Memorable places. Politizdat, Moscow, 1977, 159 pp with illustrations; (2) Idem, "Lenin v Frantsii, Bel'gii i Danii" [Lenin in France, Belgium and Denmark]. Politizdat, Moscow, 1982, 199 pp with illustrations; (3) "Lenin v Prage" [Lenin in Prague] by Miroslav Ivanov. Progress, Moscow, 1980, 256 pp]

[Text] V. I. Lenin's life is an exploit for the sake of the liberation of the toiling masses from oppression and exploitation and for the sake of building communism. Fiercely persecuted by tsarism, he was forced to spend a total of some 15 years away from Russia, languishing, as he said, in "accursed remoteness." While in exile, not even for a single day was Lenin out of touch with the revolutionary movement in the country, responding in a lively way to events within it, assessing them on a principle-minded basis and preparing the party for future battles and victories. Forcibly separated from the homeland, he nevertheless kept his close ties with Russian reality. This has been remembered by both his relatives and fellow revolutionaries. In carrying out the instructions which Lenin issued while in exile, and after frequent meetings with him, the bolshevik I. F. Popov, for example, says that "...it seemed as though he had just arrived abroad and that he was only temporarily abroad, an incidental guest, whose entire spirit was turned to the homeland and to the fire of the continuing battle" (I. F. Popov, "Odin Den' s Leninym" [One Day With Lenin]. Sovetskiy Pisatel', Moscow, 1963, p 29).

The thoughtful and scrupulously scientific study of documents, recollections, letters, facts, addresses abroad and other data related to Lenin's foreign exile period substantially broaden, enrich and refine our knowledge of his life and activities. They help us to realize more profoundly the greatness of Lenin's ideas and to imagine more fully, vividly and visibly many parts of his biography, which was inseparably linked with the heroic history of the Bolshevik Party and the revolutionary workers movement.

New interesting works have appeared in recent years on memorable places where Lenin stayed abroad. The number of studies on this problem, which has not lost its scientific significance and relevance, published in the Russian language, has reached several dozen, many of them published by Politizdat. It is to some of them that we would like to draw the attention of the readers.

Based on extremely rich factual data, their authors recreate a broad canvas of the period and the historical conditions and specific environment in which Lenin lived and worked in foreign exile--in Finland, France, Belgium, Denmark and Prague. In following the familiar places where Lenin stayed in these countries and without omitting a single significant documentary proof of any event or fact, the authors describe in detail the life of the great leader as an emigre: his tremendous practical and theoretical work and the means and methods through which he was in touch with Russia and its revolutionary workers movement, the Central Committee and the local Bolshevik Party organizations.

... The working people of 12 European countries are proud of the fact that Lenin visited or lived there. Streets, boulevards, squares, clubs and sports stadiums have been named after him. One such country is Finland, which, according to the historians, Vladimir Il'ich visited no less than 26 times, almost always clandestinely. We find this in (1). The first part of the book describes Lenin's stay in that country during the 1905-1907 Russian revolution. The materials describing this tremendous organizational and theoretical activities during a period of headlong development of the revolution, which covered ever-new cities and areas in Russia and involved the broad toiling masses, are of great interest.

In describing the political situation in Finland the authors note that its proletariat immediately responded to the revolution which had broken out in Russia: a mass meeting was held in Helsingfors on 11 January 1905, followed by demonstrations in other large cities. The events were directly influenced by the revolutionary struggle waged by the Russian proletariat, headed by the Bolshevik Party. "Finland breathed freely," Lenin wrote, "only when the Russian working class rose as a gigantic mass and shook up Russian autocracy" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 19, p 219). The friendship between the Russian and Finnish revolutionaries strengthened in the great struggle against tsarism and the bourgeoisie and for the social freedom of the working people. The general strike which broke out in Finland in October-November 1905 was a manifestation of close solidarity with the Russian revolutionary proletariat. Essentially, Finland became the main base of the activities of the Combat Technical Group of the RSDWP Central Committee. Four RSDWP conferences and several conferences of the Petersburg party organization were held on Finnish territory.

Under Lenin's leadership the bolsheviks clearly defined the role of the armed uprising as a decisive means for the overthrow of tsarist autocracy. The rising revolutionary upsurge contributed to the establishment of combat bolshevik organizations. The Combat Technical Group of the party's Central Committee helped to create combat units, to purchase and move weapons into Russia, and to organize workshops for their manufacturing. Lenin deemed it important to give military-combat work an organized nature and develop it on a partywide scale. He was always interested in the activities of combat technical groups and helped them in all possible ways. He supported the idea of convening the first conference of RSDWP military and combat organizations in Tammersfors in November 1906 and the organization of a school-laboratory for instructors, for the training of practical workers, in Kuokkala.

The authors also cover Lenin's comprehensive activities after the defeat of the December armed uprising in Moscow, particularly during his period of "close-by exile," in the Vaza cottage, in Kuokkala, which became the real center for the organization of party work. It was here that he wrote a large number of articles, pamphlets and draft resolutions. It was also from here that Lenin directed the activities of the bolshevik organizations and party meetings and conferences were held here under his guidance.

However, a long stay in the same place was impossible. The police were looking for Lenin everywhere, including Finland, which forced him to change addresses frequently. The authors follow in detail the routes he took to avoid the tsarist spies. He faced numerous dangers as he crossed the Gulf of Finland on the ice or the Russo-Finnish border on a steamer as a stoker, and when he traveled through Finland on his way to Western Europe and back to Russia. Thus, one night, walking on the still-brITTLE December ice covering the Gulf of Finland, he almost died when at one point the ice began to crack under his feet. Vladimir Il'ich later recalled that at that time his thought was "how stupid it would be to die this way."

The next section in the book takes the reader a decade ahead, to the tempestuous beginning of the spring of 1917, when Lenin returned from Russia from his second and lengthiest foreign exile. Once again his path crossed Finland. The news of the return of the great leader spread out quite rapidly. People gathered at railroad stops to see Lenin and the Russian revolutionaries. On the way to Petrograd numerous spontaneous meetings were held and Vladimir Il'ich addressed virtually all of them. A particularly warm welcome was awaiting him at the Finland Station in Petrograd. Thousands of workers and soldiers crowded the square and the adjacent streets. Lenin ended his first speech to them with the fiery slogan "Long Live the Socialist Revolution!"

The situation in Petrograd became drastically aggravated after the July 1917 events. The provisional government adopted an openly repressive policy and arrests of bolsheviks began. The bourgeois press mounted a persecution of Lenin of unparalleled scale and vileness. A warrant for his arrest was issued. At that point the party once again sent its leader into clandestinity, followed by Razliv Lake and then again in Finland, in Helsingfors, Vyborg and elsewhere. Lenin spent 110 days in hiding.

France, Belgium and Denmark were also among the countries in which Lenin lived and worked or visited briefly. Thus, he spent some 4 years in France, 3.5 of them uninterruptedly. The Paris period of his life and works is noted by important landmarks in the struggle for the preservation and strengthening of the Bolshevik Party. The Fifth (All-Russian) RSDWP Conference, the conference of the expanded editorial board of the newspaper PROLETARIY, the RSDWP Central Committee plenum, and the conference of RSDWP Central Committee members abroad were held here under Lenin's guidance.

In the spring of 1911 he created a party school in the small Longjumeau settlement near Paris, some of whose students included members of party organizations of large proletarian centers in revolutionary Russia. Lenin delivered 56 lectures from which, as recalled by the students, they felt the

breath of the revolution. It was out of Paris that Lenin guided the preparations for the Sixth All-Russian Party Conference, which was held in Prague in January 1912. The Prague conference summed up an entire historical period in the struggle waged by the bolsheviks against the mensheviks, consolidated the victory of bolshevism and strengthened the party as an all-Russian organization. This was of exceptional importance in increasing its role in the revolutionary struggle. We learn these and many other facts related to the great leader's life and activities from (2).

The authors trace in detail Lenin's seven trips to France, which preceded his Paris period, from December 1908 to June 1912 (in this connection we must mention the monograph by R. Yu. Kaganova "Lenin vo Frantsii" [Lenin in France], which deals with the Paris period in Vladimir Il'ich's life, and the second expanded edition of which was published in 1977).

Vladimir Il'ich's Paris period coincided with the beginning of the new revolutionary upsurge in Russia. The workers movement had become energized as early as the summer of 1910. In the autumn the frequency of strikes at plants and factories in the largest industrial centers increased. Lenin's prediction on the upsurge of the revolution was proving accurate. This confidence which the leader expressed in the defeat of tsarism and the inevitable victory of the proletarian revolution is revealed with particular strength in Lenin's fiery lines printed in the second issue of RABOCHAYA GAZETA, in its 31 December 1910 issue: "To work, comrades! Undertake the building of organizations everywhere for the creation and strengthening of the social democratic party cells and the development of economic and political agitation. During the first Russian revolution the proletariat taught the people's masses how to struggle for freedom; in the second it must lead them to victory!" (op. cit., vol 20, p 75). The description of the Paris period is closely linked with sections on Lenin's stay in Belgium and Denmark. These stays were shorter than his stay in France. We know that the historical Second RSDWP Congress opened in Brussels in 1903 and completed its work in London, laying the beginning of bolshevism as an independent current in political thinking and a political party. Lenin most actively participated in the congress's proceedings. The reader will find a detailed description in this book on the conditions and circumstances under which the congress took place and the selfless international aid which the Belgian social democrats gave the Russian revolutionaries. Lenin subsequently participated in the Brussels meetings of the International Socialist Bureau. He addressed the Fourth Latvian Social Democratic Congress and sharply criticized the Latvian Social Democratic Party Central Committee for its opportunist position. He called for the withdrawal of the Latvian social democrats from the Trotskyites' August bloc which was set up on a liquidationist basis.

... In the summer of 1910 Vladimir Il'ich arrived in Copenhagen to participate in the Eighth Congress of the Second International. The question of cooperatives was one of the basic topics at the congress, for which reason a struggle developed on its subject between the supporters of the revolutionary trend and the reformists. Lenin spoke out against the erroneous and harmful thesis of the "neutrality of the cooperation." He defended the Marxist concept of the mandatory subordination of the cooperative movement to the tasks

of the proletarian class struggle and the struggle for socialism. Lenin stubbornly fought the opportunistic domination in the Russian section at the congress as well. He submitted a draft resolution which contained an exhaustive definition of the place and significance of cooperatives in the class struggle. It was precisely Lenin's resolution that laid the foundations of the draft submitted to the congress by the RSDWP delegation.

While in Copenhagen Lenin visited the city library where he studied publications on Danish agriculture. The memory of these days is still alive. The working environment of that time has been recreated on Table No 9 at the library: a pile of books and a folder with papers. No one is allowed to sit there...

The working people in France, Belgium and Denmark carefully preserve the memory of the stay of the great leader of the world proletariat and the founder and leader of the first socialist state in the world in their countries. The entire world is familiar today with Marie-Rose Street in Paris, where Vladimir Il'ich and Nadezhda Konstantinovna lived for some time. A memorial plaque stands on the home and the apartment has been turned into a V. I. Lenin museum. There is a Lenin boulevard in the workers district in Paris. Similar memorial plaques may be found on many buildings in Paris, Brussels, Liege and Copenhagen.

Czechoslovakia was one of the 12 countries where Vladimir Il'ich visited or lived in the course of his forced exile. For the past 25 years extensive studies related to his stay in Czechoslovakia have been under way in that country. The V. I. Lenin Museum in Prague is the center and organizer of this comprehensive and purposeful project. Czech literary worker Miroslav Ivanov has studied for many years archive documents, press publications, recollections of contemporaries, testimony of eyewitnesses and library and museum files. The resulting material was the basis for the book (3). It is as though the author opens to the readers the door to his creative laboratory, inviting everyone in and together conducting an interesting trip along the places related to Lenin's stay. In comparing the various written sources, recollections of witnesses and participants in the events of those distant days he brings up interesting facts and details and gradually the reader develops an impressive picture of the activities of Lenin and his fellow workers in Czechoslovakia.

A thorough study of Lenin's correspondence, documents, letters to relatives and friends and other materials helps Miroslav Ivanov to determine the time of Vladimir Il'ich's first visit to Prague. He studies in their details and totality the circumstances by virtue of which it was precisely Prague which was chosen as a seat for the January 1912 party conference. He describes the complex and artfully confused conspiratorial mechanism which Lenin and the Bolsheviks were forced to resort to in order to avoid detection.

The book deals extensively with the Prague Bolshevik conference. The lively description helps us to gain a fuller idea of the tremendous preparatory work and the proceedings of the conference itself as well as the circumstances in which it was held.

The author writes that Lenin paid particular attention to how everything should be prepared and created, the extent to which this was possible, the creation of favorable conditions for the delegates and the successful work of the conference. Noteworthy in this connection are excerpts cited in the book from the memoirs of Ye. P. Onufriyev, a fitter at the Obukhovskiy Plant and conference delegate: "We traveled on sleighs almost to the border, after which we took the train first to Berlin and then to Leipzig. Everywhere we were expected by our people who gave us the necessary assistance. Lenin was particularly concerned with everything, although this fact became known only later."

All 23 sessions of the Sixth All-Russian RSDWP Conference were held in the strictest possible secrecy in the modest room of the Social Democratic People's Club on Gibernskaya Street, which houses the V. I. Lenin Museum today.

Lenin was the universally acknowledged leader and the heart of the historical Prague conference. He was elected its chairman, submitted reports and wrote draft resolutions on the items on the agenda, which were subsequently ratified. Lenin's report and addresses offered a profound study of the situation in the party and the political situation in the country. The forthcoming and most important tasks were efficiently formulated. The conference expelled from the proletarian party the liquidationists and put once and for all an end to the official association with the mensheviks.

The documentary evidence used by the author allows the reader to realize more profoundly the tremendous importance of the Prague conference in terms of the future of the Bolshevik Party. In noting its success, Lenin wrote to M. Gor'kiy that "we shall soon be sending you the conference resolutions. The liquidationist scum notwithstanding, we have finally been able to restore the party and its Central Committee. I hope that you will be as pleased by this as we are" (op. cit., vol 48, p 44).

The 52 short chapters, some not exceeding 20 or 30 lines, in Miroslav Ivanov's book interestingly narrate the long years of tireless studies conducted by the author of the new facts and information on Lenin's life and work in Prague, the addresses of the homes and apartments where he stayed, and the people who were involved, to one extent or another, in the Prague conference and who were helping Il'ich at that time.

The author himself says that although he has been able to find a great deal much remains hidden.... However, the significance of the Prague conference remain through the years and decades.... "Things developed and will develop" (op. cit., vol 48, p 50), although "the conference started a great battle" (ibid., p 55), Lenin wrote after the conference.... The Prague conference won and with it, so did Vladimir Il'ich.

"The last witnesses are dying and legends and tales are already appearing....

"These are legends of our time, legends of the 20th century about a man who walked the streets of Prague, who loved the simple people, for which reason he

dedicated his entire life to them. These are legends of an exceptionally modest person who could spend the night in an inn, sleeping on the floor, a gentle man who played with a little girl who jumped on his lap....

"These are legends of Vladimir Il'ich" (pp 252-253).

These are the words with which the vivid and interesting story of Lenin's stay in Prague ends.

Let us note in conclusion the good presentation of the books under review. In particular, the books printed by Politizdat include many interesting photographs of memorable places such as houses, streets, and apartments directly related to Lenin's life and activities in exile, documents, announcements on meetings, lectures and debates, and photographs of people who selflessly helped Il'ich during those hard times, hiding him from the tsarist spies and organizing contacts with party comrades and the Central Committee, as well as supplying him with everything necessary. These books, written in a simple and lively style, are read with great interest.

Written on the basis of reliable historical and archive materials and literary and memoir sources, and on the basis of the author's personal visits to a number of places where Lenin stayed, they help us to imagine more completely, profoundly and vividly Lenin's life in foreign exile and his truly gigantic efforts to create a proletarian party of a new type--the Bolshevik Party--the development of a revolutionary Marxist theory and the preparations for a victorious socialist revolution.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1983

5003

CSO: 1802/12

FUNDAMENTAL ISSUE OF PARTY WORK

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 6, Apr 83 pp 118-121

[Unattributed book review: "Utverzhdat' Leninskiy Stil' v Partiynoy Rabote" [Asserting the Leninist Style in Party Work] by K. U. Chernenko, Politizdat, Moscow, 1983, 574 pp]

[Text] Today, more than 2 years after the 26th CPSU Congress, it can be firmly stated that the strategic trends set and specified by the congress for the broad front of economic, social and cultural construction have been correct and the methods and forms of party leadership both reliable and effective.

At the same time an objective appraisal of the achieved results makes it possible to view the issues that have not yet been resolved and the reserves that have not yet been utilized, both from principled positions and in a deeper and more party-minded manner; and not only to study attentively the causes of existing shortcomings, derelictions and blunders, but also to adopt resolute, strategic and well-informed measures for eliminating them. This was forcibly underscored anew by Comrade Yu. V. Andropov, CPSU Central Committee general secretary, in his speech at the Central Committee plenum in November 1982, in his report "60 Years of the USSR" and also in his article "Karl Marx's Doctrine and Certain Issues of Socialist Construction in the USSR."

Life confirms that the successful accomplishment of tasks formulated by the congress is most closely bound to the unceasing creative process of perfecting party leadership and the style, forms and methods of the party organizations' activities on all levels. To keep in step with the enhanced demands and the increasingly complicated tasks, to know how to analyze and appraise circumstances from Marxist-Leninist positions, to work out the only correct line that would exclude diffuse, unconsidered and half-baked decisions--all these are important features of the Leninist style of party work adopted by the communists.

This kind of approach to the style of party leadership is disclosed in the book "To Consolidate the Leninist Style in Party Work" by K. U. Chernenko, CPSU Central Committee Politburo member and secretary.

The book contains the author's speeches and articles published after the 26th CPSU Congress. They reflect the purposeful, dynamic nature of party activity for mobilizing the communists and all working people to resolve the tasks formulated by the congress, and they raise a number of issues that are of an all-party significance.

Using the activities of the CPSU Central Committee and of local party organizations as an example in analyzing the style, forms and methods of party leadership in the period of advanced socialism, K. U. Chernenko discloses the creative laboratory of party and state work and shows the inexhaustible influence of Leninist ideas on all spheres of social, economic and political life of our society.

The author concentrates his attention on the issues of party leadership in ideological and political-educational work. In the present phase, in which the party regards the further perfection of advanced socialism as the main task, ideological work is imbued with a qualitatively new significance. Today it must concentrate on the fundamental problems of the country's economic and sociopolitical development, on the key positions of our party's domestic and foreign policy.

"A convincing, specific demonstration of our achievements, a serious analysis of new problems that are constantly cropping up in life, a fresh mind and fresh formulations--this is the path toward perfecting our entire propaganda, which must always be truthful and realistic, but also interesting and intelligible, and thus also more effective," Comrade Yu. V. Andropov noted.

To conduct ideological work in inseparable unity with the entire political, organizational and socioeconomic activity of the party--this is a task of paramount importance. Its successful solution is vitally bound to the enhancement of the party's leading role in the society of advanced socialism.

K. U. Chernenko remarks that the most important component of the style of party work is the practical ensurance of the firm unity of ideological and organizational activity on all levels. It is here that we find a powerful reserve for enhancing the communists' vanguard role in accomplishing complicated, innovative tasks set by the party in the present phase. As a rule--and this is confirmed by life--the shortcomings in organizational work negatively affect the party's ideological life and lower the efficiency of the communist rearing of working people. At the same time, any weakening of educational work among the masses and a lowering of its ideological-theoretical standards are fraught with the danger of undermining the party's leading role in society. Both the science and art of party leadership, and also its style, find their expression in ensuring the best possible merging of these two most important aspects of party work.

The author focuses attention on the fact that the intensification of scientific foundations of the party's political and organization work is inseparable from the creative development of Leninism--the world outlook and methodological foundation of the party's entire life and activity. A creative, critical-constructive attitude toward theoretical issues, toward comprehending the traversed path and the accumulated experience--this is the most important prerequisite of the party's successfully working out the concept of advanced socialism. On this basis the CPSU was able to clearly define its strategy and tactics for a lengthy historical period, and to specify and precisely define the paths and deadlines for realizing our programmatic goals; and this was also reflected in the documents of the 26th Congress.

Speaking of the powerful theoretical weapon at our disposal for resolving the fundamental problems that are cropping up today, K. U. Chernenko underscores the unshakeable significance of materialist dialectics as the comprehensive, rich contents and profound doctrine of development. The great changes that are taking place in all spheres of the society of mature socialism, the need for an increasingly fuller exposure and utilization of its possibilities, insistently demand a further creative development of materialist dialectics and a deep knowledge of its categories, principles and laws. Obviously, the most prominent place is held here by the main and initial category of Marxist-Leninist dialectics--the category of contradiction, and its application in socialism in the same way that they are inherent in every developing and growing social organism. The art of political leadership, of the scientific guidance of society, lies exactly in the timely demonstration of these contradictions and in tracing the paths toward overcoming them. Theoretical research is particularly important here--research conducted up to the level of scientific-practical recommendations.

A prominent role is played in this by social sciences and by social scientists. "However," K. U. Chernenko notes, "certain social scientists deplorably find it hard to forsake well-trodden paths. Is this why we still can encounter thoughtless repetitions of formulas that have been overcome, superficial commentaries on generally known truths, or else a mechanical registering of facts, even if it sometimes claims to be a scientific generalization? Obviously, this shows not only inertia or laziness in thinking, but also the inability to adopt a critical attitude toward one's own generalizations, generalizations advanced some time ago and not confirmed by life" (p 105).

The author points out the need to deeply study such issues on primary theoretical and practical significance as the nature and species of contradictions which are typical for the contemporary phase of the Soviet society's development, and also of the objective and subjective factors from which they stem. An all-round theoretical analysis of the problems that are cropping up helps the party to comprehend more deeply the economic, social or other causes of these or those contradictions, and to seek and find ways for resolving them efficiently and in time.

In the broad range of problems connected with tightening the unity of the party's ideological and organizational activity, the book reserves a particularly prominent place for the issues of interconnections between the party's socioeconomic policy and the rearing of the new man. The author closely connects the cornerstone issues of ideoeducational work with the practical realization of the party's economic and social policy as worked out by the 26th Congress: namely, with the intensification and enhanced efficacy of production; acceleration of scientific-technical progress; enhanced professional standards and creative activities of workers, and their interest in the results of work; improved management system of economy; and so forth. He underscores that, under the present conditions, the efforts of all ideological workers (as well as of theorists and practitioners) must be concentrated on further working out, and implementing in life, the ideas formulated by the party in the last few years in the sphere of communist education. In this context particular attention is due to the stipulations contained in the

documents of the 26th CPSU Congress, which stipulate that the success of educational work is ensured only if this work is based on the stable foundation of socioeconomic policy; that it is imperative to actively shape a personality's needs and interests; and that the shaping of the new man depends to a decisive extent on the way the unity of ideotheoretical, political-educational, organizational and economic work is ensured in practice.

The book notes that it is basically important for the party to strive to achieve effective results in this most important sphere not by using the force of its power, or through administrative measures, but through the force of conviction, the personal example of every communist, and the constant care for the people's political education. This is greatly assisted by our deepening socialist democracy and developing socialist competition, as well as by an active fight against bureaucracy and violations of state and working discipline, against any and all manifestations of unthriftiness and wastefulness.

In developing this theme the author raises, as one of the important and topical issues, the issue of the educational force of the example set by a communist leader. Every communist, and even more so one entrusted with the high confidence invested in a leader, must act as the bearer of high ideological, moral qualities both at work and in everyday life. This represents a tiny part of the confidence and authority won by the Leninist party among the masses, due to the great truth of its cause and to its constant care for the Soviet people's needs and interests. The working people judge to a considerable extent the whole party according to the acts and activity of communists. This means that the authority of a communist consists of the sum total of the authority of our entire party.

And this authority is not acquired with rank or position, or due to former merits or nice words. "Selflessness and principle-mindedness, clear political thinking and an acute sense of the new, a highly demanding attitude toward oneself and toward others, sensitiveness, modesty, and lack of artificiality in manners and habits," the author writes, "this is the true picture of a communist, regardless of whether he is a rank-and-file party member or a leader" (p 63).

The book underscores the special role of communists, party workers, and economic managers in the organization and perfection of ideoeducational and propaganda work in collectives. This important work does not permit formalism--this great, intolerable evil. Manifestations of formalism in the sphere of education and propaganda in the best case leave a feeling of dissatisfaction in people, and frequently even irritate them. They can create a fertile soil for the penetration of alien, harmful views and moods. The road toward overcoming these manifestations is indicated by practice and has been clearly formulated by our party: It lies in ensuring the unity of word and deed, the unity of ideotheoretical, political-educational and economic work. Of course, every leader and party worker must primarily see to the creation in a working collective of a healthy sociopsychological atmosphere based on the combination of a high degree of discipline, initiative, and responsibility of every worker, and of exacting, but benevolent relations among the people. This is also the direct duty of party committees and all communists.

The book devotes great attention to issues connected with enhancing the efficacy of mass information and propaganda means. Underscoring their extraordinary significance in our contemporary conditions as a powerful complex of means for ideologically influencing the masses, the author considers it paramount to unwaveringly continue to enhance the ideological standards, contents, scientific precision and objectivity of published materials, and also their being in agreement with the interests of the people and the party policy.

The author reviews many aspects of activities pursued by information and propaganda media in close interrelation with the development of criticism and self-criticism, which V. I. Lenin regarded as the most important ideomoral and political principle of all communists. It is a powerful tool for learning about reality and transforming it, for consolidating party and state discipline and overcoming one-sided opinions and rigid thinking. Lenin called for boldly exposing existent shortcomings and mistakes. Today, too, this demand is of topical significance. The task, the book says, is to continue and perfect the work on creating an atmosphere of free and businesslike criticism of our shortcomings, to strive to make this criticism principle-minded and constructive so that it would combine an exacting attitude with benevolence and respect for the personality and its dignity. It must help people work with greater initiative and energy, it must consolidate in them the feeling of confidence in their capabilities; in the working collectives it must evoke a resolution to liquidate omissions and obtain better results.

Underscoring the special role of the mass information media in developing criticism and self-criticism, the author speaks of the need for the organs of the press, radio, television and party committees to cooperate closely and purposefully in a comradely manner. Regrettably, he writes, there are still leaders in the party, soviet, economic and other bodies who regard journalists as mere "petty critics" who allegedly hamper normal work. Such leaders discern in every statement in the press, be it even matter-of-fact or constructive, only a public revelation of their own failures; and that is why they protest. In this context the author recalls the immutable law governing the life of our party and our society: Nobody may stand outside the criticism of the masses. Nobody may identify his personal prestige--using the authority of his enterprise, ministry, rayon or oblast as a cover--with the prestige of society and the state.

The analysis of instances of a "nervous," unpartylike attitude to criticism, the book notes, shows that, as a rule, they stem from inordinate self-esteem or, more often, from a low political, moral and professional niveau of individual leading workers, from their having broken away from the masses. And all the while it was found a long time ago that to protect a leader from healthy criticism means to condemn him to complacency, to stifle in him the beneficial feeling of internal dissatisfaction with what had been achieved and the endeavor to search for new opportunities of enhancing the effectiveness and quality of his work.

The force and effectiveness of the impact of the mass information media directly depend on the political training and professional skill of journalists. They must always bear in mind their responsibility to the reader,

which means their responsibility to the people, to the party; they must clearly realize that critical material is no precocious sensation. It must always be backed by carefully checked, well-considered facts which really have a social significance. Objectivity, truthfulness, an offensive spirit--these are the main sources of the force and efficacy of our mass information media and their organizing role.

"With regard to the manifestations of suppression of criticism, or of persecution for criticism, which here and there have not yet been eradicated," K. U. Chernenko writes, "the party's opinion on these matters is well-known; it was reaffirmed by the 26th CPSU Congress: No connivance with regard to suppressors!" (p 489).

A self-critical approach to all matters becomes particularly significant as the tasks which we are resolving acquire greater scope and become increasingly complicated. The CPSU is constantly developing criticism and self-criticism. This is one of the most important principles of our socialist democracy, a proven method of overcoming shortcomings, of successfully progressing. And the measures for influencing those who react to criticism in a wrong way are also provided for in the party's statutes and the USSR Constitution.

The book devotes considerable attention to the issues of ideological struggle in the international arena and to the perfection of our foreign-political information and propaganda. The topical nature of this work, its purposeful nature and influence under contemporary conditions, the author underscores, are important also because the attacks of our class enemy against the ideological and moral values of socialism are persistently increasing, and the attempts to exert a disintegrating influence on the minds of the population in the socialist countries are becoming more and more sophisticated. Our past and present experience teaches us: If a ruling Marxist-Leninist party does not fight alien opinions and moods and underrates the significance of revolutionary theory, if it does not carry out active political-educational work among its ranks, among all classes and groups, then a revival, a "reanimation" of the bourgeois and petty bourgeois ideology and psychology takes place in society. And this inadvertently weakens the party and the workers' class ideologically and politically, and opens up scope for the activities of antisocialist forces wherever they had been preserved.

Our propagandists and agitators, our journalists have at their disposal a powerful weapon--the enormous achievements of real socialism--which enables them not only to actively oppose the onslaught of bourgeois propaganda, but also to successfully conduct offensive, effective ideological work along the entire front. The effectiveness of our foreign-political propaganda is convincingly testified to by the obvious collapse of the frantic campaign "in defense of human rights," allegedly violated in the USSR, a campaign unleashed in the West, and above all in the United States. Our mass information and propaganda media have unmasked by suitable arguments the entire falsehood and slander to which the organizers of this shameful campaign have resorted.

In this connection one must mention K. U. Chernenko's work "The CPSU and Human Rights," included in the book. It may justly be considered an example of the convincing, intelligible and offensive propaganda of our Soviet way of life, of the true human rights and liberties that are guaranteed by the society of advanced socialism. This publication, translated into foreign languages, is helping our numerous friends abroad to carry the truth into the masses, the truth about the country of the Soviets and of real socialism. Here is what Ellen (Perlo), veteran member of the U.S. Communist Party, wrote in the magazine of American communists, POLITICAL AFFAIRS (1982), in connection with the publication of K. U. Chernenko's work "The CPSU and Human Rights:" "Konstantin Ustinovich Chernenko, CPSU Central Committee Politburo member and secretary, wrote a smallish, but important and exhaustive book which clearly shows the way the Soviet government works and which explains the provisions of the Constitution which guarantee the Soviet people's rights in all spheres of life.... Of course, absolute freedom does not exist in this world. That would mean anarchy. And so it is true that certain restrictions do exist in the USSR: for instance, the propaganda of racism, of national hatred, and also of war and of militarism is prohibited by law..." After dealing in detail with the provisions listed in K. U. Chernenko's book, which concern the everyday life of the Soviet people--their right to work, relaxation, education, medical care, social insurance and also the right to housing accomodation--Ellen (Perlo) then emphasizes: "These provisions are explained in such detail that they can satisfy any reader, apart from the most fanatical anti-Soviets; they are capable of evoking envy in the deprived Americans--in the unemployed, homeless, needy and aged, in those who are ill and helpless."

There has been much similar reaction among our friends abroad. They convincingly say that such publications are greatly needed and very useful; that they not only explain and defend the truth about real socialism, but also turn it into a weapon of combat and offensive weapon.

The materials gathered together in K. U. Chernenko's book "To Consolidate the Leninist Style in Party Work" reveal many aspects of the party's and people's activities after the 26th CPSU Congress. They play a mobilizing role, and simultaneously they encourage a critical analysis of the path traversed; they encourage reflections on things it has not yet been possible to realize, or things which did not work out as desired. Undoubtedly, the book will be of effective assistance to the party workers, propagandists and the broad party aktiv in finding a deeper and creative approach to organizational and mass-political work for implementing the decisions of the 26th CPSU Congress in life.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1983

CSO: 1802/12

LENINIST FOUNDATIONS OF THE ORGANIZATION OF THE STATE OF THE WHOLE PEOPLE

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 6, Apr 83 pp 122-124

[Review by G. Ostroumov of the book "Konstitutsionnyye Osnovy Organizatsii Sovetskogo Obshchenarodnogo Gosudarstva" [The Constitutional Foundations of the Organization of the Soviet State of the Whole People] by N. P. Farberov. Nauka, Moscow, 1982, 222 pp]

[Text] In defining the tasks of the social sciences, the 26th CPSU Congress called for analyzing more profoundly and boldly the phenomena in social political life. Unquestionably, this task directly affects the science of the state, for, as V. I. Lenin emphasized, the structure of the governmental system is the most important and essential in politics (see "Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 23, p 239). "... Politics," he wrote, "means participation in governmental affairs, directing the state and defining the methods, tasks and content of governmental activities..." (op. cit., vol 33, p 340).

Active participation in the formulation of the draft of the 1977 USSR Constitution and the interpretation of the comprehensive processes related to its exercise prove the attention which the Soviet science of the state pays to topical problems raised by the political and the entire social practice of developed socialism. The intensified study of the democratic social nature of socialist statehood, the characteristics of its functioning under contemporary conditions and the substantiation of the practical means for its improvement are characteristic features of state-legal studies. The new work by Prof N. P. Farberov is to a large extent an example of such an analysis.

The work draws the reader's attention above all by its intent, which is to study the foundations on which the organization of the socialist state of the whole people rests. This is a very topical task in a number of respects, above all because the state of the whole people is the basic tool in building the new society throughout the entire stage of developed socialism. Furthermore, as Comrade Yu. V. Andropov has pointed out, it is important to bear in mind that our country stands at the start of a lengthy historical stage which, in turn, will have its own periods and stages of growth. Hence the need for the fullest and clearest possible identification of the new features which are already distinguishing the state of the whole people as well as the features which determine the continuity between the different stages in the overall development of socialist statehood.

In the course of several decades our country and the CPSU acquired tremendous and varied practical experience in building socialism and communism. This experience is interpreted through the theoretical thinking of the party and the Soviet social sciences. The USSR Constitution is its concentrated manifestation in which the targets and ways of further development of our entire society, approved by the whole people, have been clearly formulated. It is precisely the country's fundamental law that expresses and codifies the basic principles which ensure the reliable and efficient activity of the entire complex and many-faceted system of contemporary Soviet statehood with all its components, from top to bottom.

As the author proves, the USSR Constitution ensures the consistency between the state organs and the national-state system and the rights, freedoms and obligations of the citizens at the mature socialist stage reached by our country. The author describes through tangible examples the manner in which the basic Leninist ideas on socialist statehood, the leading role of the communist party and the principles of democratic centralism and socialist legality are embodied in the fundamental law. This is one of the unquestionable merits of this work which, although a study, can also be used as an aid and reliable work of reference by propagandists and by anyone interested in problems related to the development of socialist democracy.

The book formulates a number of major problems, the profound understanding of which largely determines the choice of proper approaches through the solution of the numerous practical problems related to improving socialist statehood. They include the correlation between strengthening the state of the whole people and the further development of democracy. The author emphasizes the profound, the organic interconnection between these processes in which true democracy finds its manifestation.

Not only the development of the state apparatus but, above all, the enhancement of the political activeness of the masses and the increased participation of the working people in the administration of governmental affairs, the author states, are of decisive importance in the advancement of the socialist state of the whole people (see p 53). The very formulation of the question of increasing the role of the state is justifiably related to the increased scale and complexity of the tasks of society as it develops. Hence the increased requirements related to the efficient activities of state organs and the operativeness, coordination and efficiency and steady renovation of the ways and means through which their ties with the masses are maintained. In discussing the strengthening of the state, the author notes the increased relevance of Lenin's stipulation to the effect that "the state is strong through the consciousness of the masses" (op. cit., vol 35, p 21). Equally beneficial on this level is the stipulation that the strengthened role of the state is related to the increased reciprocal responsibility of the state and the citizens and the increased responsibility of the state apparatus and the officials to society. Such strengthening of the role of the state, naturally, has nothing in common with the notorious rejection of the Marxist idea of the withering away of the state of which the CPSU and the Soviet system are being groundlessly accused by some of our foreign "opponents," who display in this connection a rather superficial knowledge of both our practice and theory.

The constitution of the mature socialist society calls for the adoption of the necessary measures to strengthen the democratic principles in the activities of the state apparatus and the increased participation of the citizens in the administration of social and governmental affairs. The author justifiably describes all of these measures as the development of people's self-management.

In analyzing the social nature of the political system of the socialist society and the principles and means for the exercise of the rights of the soviets of people's deputies, the author leads the reader to the conclusion that "true socialist self-management is an inseparable feature of the entire socialist state system based on the principle of democratic centralism" (p 105).

An unquestionable merit of the work under review is its emphasis on the profound organic tie which exists between self-management by the working people and the exercise of socialist state power, although, naturally, the study can hardly encompass the entire specific variety of means through which such ties are or could be achieved. Nevertheless, the entire work convincingly shows the dialectics of development of the state and society characteristic of our time.

In describing the development of this process today, the author does not go to extremes, as has occasionally been the case of some experts on government. Thus, for example, he emphasizes the need to apply state coercion in the case of individuals who violate the norms of law and order. The extensive participation of the public in the struggle for strengthening them, he points out, should not weaken the influence of the state over violators. Measures of a social nature should not replace but supplement the work of the militia, the prosecutor's office, the courts, and the other state organs (see p 43). At the same time, the development of the state of the whole people presumes the steady broadening of its creative constructive mission. In our view, the author is correct in favoring the acknowledgment of a basic function of the state of the whole people as its broad and varied social activity.

In considering the problem of the organizational forms of socialist statehood, N. P. Farberov is guided by Lenin's ideas on the Republic of Soviets. Like other Soviet researchers, he does not limit himself to citing the classical methodological arguments or the formulation of theoretical concepts, however original they may be. As a rule, such concepts are used by the author to substantiate a number of views regarding practical improvements in the organization and activities of Soviet state organs. Let us note some of them.

Thus, the author justifiably points out that the letter and the spirit of the current constitution stipulate that the sessions of soviets deal increasingly with managerial work. In this connection, he supports the already formulated suggestions that soviet sessions be extended.

He formulates interesting considerations on the possibilities of developing the democratic principles governing the establishment of soviets, based on

the stipulations contained in the new USSR Constitution. In particular, it is a question of the possibility of using both territorial and production principles in demarcating electoral districts for elections to soviets. In a number of cases this would make it possible to strengthen the ties between the voters and the deputies and would facilitate the organization of control and accountability.

In noting the extensive rights granted labor collectives, codified in the USSR Constitution, the author emphasizes that the efforts to enhance their role as the most important units of socialist democracy also means concern for the communist upbringing of the working people, the growth of the creative initiative of the Soviet people and for upgrading their activeness in the administration of social and production affairs.

The main purpose of drawing the attention of the readers to the merits of this work is its formulation, profoundly and, from our viewpoint, accurately, a number of ideologically sensitive and topical problems of the theory and practice of development of socialist statehood. However, it is precisely for the same reason that we should note some of its shortcomings. The compressed and concise style used by the author gives occasionally the impression of a summary of short theses which, although interesting and important in themselves, are not always adequately substantiated. Occasionally the author seems to ignore the process leading to the accurate solution of the problems he raises. The part discussing the place and role of social organizations in the Soviet political system is excessively brief. For example, Lenin's stipulation to the effect that the trade unions were and remain the closest and mandatory associates of the governmental system deserves a more profound discussion. He has also paid insufficient attention to the problems of the participation of young people in social life. The contemporary significance of Lenin's ideas on improving the Soviet state apparatus, found in his latest works such as "Better Less But Better," "How to Reorganize the Rabkrin," "On Assigning Legislative Functions to the Gosplan" and others, should have been analyzed more completely and profoundly.

In the course of its steady efforts to improve Soviet statehood, the CPSU calls for the study and consideration of the experience in the development of the fraternal socialist states. This experience, as we know, was taken into consideration in drafting the new Soviet constitution. Naturally, this is a large and essentially different topic. That is obviously why it has merely been mentioned by the author. As a whole, this book may be justifiably considered a profound and useful study of the contemporary embodiment of Lenin's ideas in the organization and activities of the Soviet state.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1983

5003

CSO: 1802/12

FOR A PARTY LITERATURE

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 6, Apr 83 pp 124-125

[Review by V. Ozerov of the book "Zhivaya Sila Leninskikh Idey" [The Living Force of Lenin's Ideas] by I. S. Chernoutsan. Sovetskiy Pisatel', Moscow, 1982, 248 pp]

[Text] The book under review considers against a broad historical background V. I. Lenin's theoretical legacy in the area of artistic creativity and the stages in the development of socialist aesthetics.

Lenin's famous article "Party Organization and Party Literature" and the works of V. V. Vorovskiy and A. V. Lunacharskiy are presented in an organically interrelated form with other works written at different times on general problems of literary studies. The articles cover the methodological foundations of the Marxist-Leninist science of literature and literary criticism consistent with the basic requirements of the age of social reorganization of the world. The revolutionary energy of the masses, awakened by the proletarian revolution in Russia, which assumed an unparalleled scope in the course of the building of socialism, expected and demanded a highly social and spiritually active art. Lenin's concept of literature as part of all-proletarian and partywide project became a reliable compass in pursuing ideological-artistic searches precisely along this way.

In his discussion of the prime sources of the new art, the author turns to the aesthetic views of Marx and Engels, which are based on the revolutionary change made by Marx in the social science and are determined by the course of the struggle for the implementation of communist ideals. The Marxist concepts of art, imbued with a militant trend, were extended and further developed in Lenin's theory of the party-mindedness of literature and art.

Articles on "Literary Legacy" and "V. I. Lenin and A. V. Lunacharskiy," and V. V. Vorovskiy's "On Aesthetics and Literary Criticism" go beyond mere historical-literary interest. The latter and, partially, the former articles are in the nature of monographs. However, they are not merely descriptive-biographical. The articles express the tension of the political and ideological battles waged by the Bolsheviks for a truly national and party-minded literature.

The person of A. V. Lunacharskiy is revealed in the book in its entire outstanding talent, although the author does not bypass his errors which Lenin criticized.

The essay on V. V. Vorovskiy's literary critical activities is a definite success. Vorovskiy was a highly educated publicistic literary worker with a refined feeling for beauty. His articles, pamphlets and notes are models of excited, thought-out and convincing discussion of life based on literature and on the unity between the ideological and artistic approaches to it (in the Dobrolyubov tradition!). As a Marxist critic, he analyzed all phenomena from precise class positions, distinguishing, like Lenin, between the two cultures within each national culture. Vorovskiy enthusiastically promoted in literature anything which contained a charge of spiritual energy, which was so greatly needed by awakening Russia.

He heaped anger and sarcasm on the spokesmen for reactionary renegade ideology, volte-face and decadence. He also argued with the acknowledged "masters of the mind" if--subjectively or objectively--their works disarmed the people ideologically and morally, depriving them of the will to fight, which had to be preserved--as it did--even after the defeat of the first Russian revolution. His respect for L. Andreyev's talent did not prevent the critic from sharply criticizing in 1908 his novel "T'ma" [Darkness] which asserted the futility and senselessness of the revolution. Although he valued highly I. Bunin, the noted supporter of critical realism, in 1910 Vorovskiy described the picture presented in his novel "Derevnya" [Countryside] as one-sided, for it failed to depict the new revolutionary processes developing within the Russian peasantry (see pp 209-210).

His criticism was principled. Vorovskiy proceeded from the unavoidable fact that the limited class positions of a writer always prevents him from accurately understanding the laws of reality and impoverishes artistically even the most talented artist.

Idea-mindedness and artistry are inseparable elements of the creative process. This Leninist behest is the foundation of the concept expressed in the work under review. The author discusses dialectically the discussion of the cognitive nature of art and its creative activeness. "Art," the critic writes, "is a specific area of knowledge, knowledge of what is artistic, which is as infinite and independent as science. By artistically mastering life, based on scientific achievements, it opens the way to new truths and discovers new laws governing human life. It enriches our knowledge and makes its contribution to it" (p 21). An artist standing on the positions of socialist realism has as his objective the truthful knowledge and reflection of real life as it changes. Through specific artistic means he tries to strengthen his state, acting as a scout for new developments which deserve his comprehensive support. The CPSU Central Committee accountability report to the 26th Party Congress emphasizes that "to live with the interests of the people and to share happiness and sadness with them, to assert the truth of life and our humanistic ideals, and to be an active participant in the building of communism precisely represents the truly national and party-minded nature of art." These words clearly reveal a continuity with the fundamental stipulations in Lenin's article "The Party Organization and Party Literature."

The author's views on the falseness of concepts according to which art can play an active role only or primarily by depicting negative phenomena are relevant. The polemics with negativism, which we find in the book, should not be terminated. It is no secret that to this day occasionally the view sneaks into literary circles to the effect that most interesting are works which draw the attention to the shady sides of life, describing them extensively and sometimes savoring them. Similar to it is a certain neutrality, while objectivistically describing the shortcomings of our moral opposites, maintain the position of the uninvolved observer, a position which, practically stated, is antisocial and antihumane!

In his study of Lenin's immortal works and A. M. Gor'kiy's artistic masterpieces and views, the critic deems it necessary to emphasize that Soviet art, imbued with humanistic enthusiasm, "asserts the heroic ethics and morality, revealing within it the beauty and charm of the features of the heroic character who inspires others through the example of his toil and exploits" (p 81).

The author extensively discusses the truthful depiction of the heroic character. He argues with skeptics and nihilists as well as supporters of the so-called ideal character, i.e., a lifeless presentation invented for the sake of glossing over reality. In promoting the outstanding and large characters, who embody the strength and beauty of the socialist system and the richness of the individual, he categorically rejects any attempt at simplistically depicting the progressive person and artificially designing a kind of "model" of a person which time has still not created. However, the critic never forgets the question of the duty of the artist to be a pioneer of the new in this area as well, and to reflect changes in man which have not as yet become fully apparent but which are ripening and very promising.

The author discusses instructive historical events: Lenin's sharp polemics against the theory and practice of the Proletkul't, and his occasionally complex relations with Gor'kiy, Lunacharskiy and others. He reminds us once again of Lenin's instruction of the need for guiding culture persistently and principle-mindedly, and concernedly to nurture talent. He debunks groundless efforts to interpret Lenin's policy in the field of culture as liberal-objectivistic or, conversely, directly administrative. No two views are possible here: always and steadfastly Lenin demanded that this important sector in partywide work be guided skillfully, with an understanding of its specific and characteristic features, without issuing orders or adopting a utilitarian approach.

The party is systematically pursuing the Leninist course in the field of artistic creativity. The CPSU Central Committee decree "On the Creative Ties Between Literary-Artistic Journals and the Practice of Communist Construction" was a considerable landmark along this way.

Written in a lively and passionate style, I. S. Chernoutsan's literary critical articles help in resolving problems of the further advancement of artistic culture in our society.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1983

5003

CSO: 1802/12

HISTORY OF SOCIOLOGY AND IDEOLOGICAL STRUGGLE

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 6, Apr 83 pp 126-127

[Review by A. Teyev, candidate of philosophical sciences, of the following books: (1) "Istoriya Burzhuaznoy Sotsiologii XIX-Nachala XX Veka" [History of Bourgeois Sociology of the 19th and Beginning of the 20th Centuries]. Nauka, Moscow, 1979, 344 pp; (2) "Istoriya Burzhuaznoy Sotsiologii Pervoy Poloviny XX Veka" [History of Bourgeois Sociology During the First Half of the 20th Century]. Nauka, Moscow, 1979, 306 pp; (3) "Burzhuaznaya Sotsiologicheskaya Teoriya" [Bourgeois Sociological Theory] by I. I. Antonovich. Critical essay on main trends, concepts and categories. Vysheishaya Shkola, Minsk, part I, 1980, 255 pp; part II, 1981, 318 pp]

[Text] The critical study of non-Marxist concepts in the history of sociology is of great importance above all because sociology within the system of the bourgeois outlook remains a source of ideological substantiation of concepts regarding the realities of social life dominant under capitalism. To this day the bourgeois ideologues borrow many of their views from past sociology in the struggle against the increasing influence of Marxism-Leninism. The origins of the ideological currents in the imperialist age must be known if they are to be properly assessed. This would hardly be possible without a scientific history of non-Marxist sociology.

An increasing number of books which analyze and criticize bourgeois sociological concepts are being published in our country with every passing year. However, until recently virtually no specialized works which summarize studies of the history of non-Marxist sociology as a whole had been published, although the need for them was great. The publication of the first works on the history of bourgeois sociology in domestic (as well as foreign Marxist) literature, covering its development from its origins to the middle of the 20th century, can therefore not be ignored.

The books under review do not merely combine basic problems and approaches to their solution. In terms of their nature and topics these books considerably supplement each other. Whereas (1) is a basic academic study of orientations, schools and directions in their historical development, (3) is a study of the basic theoretical postulates, categories and subjects treated in sociology on the basis of historical data. Together, these books enable us to see an overall critical picture of the basic directions followed in the development of bourgeois sociology.

The antihistorical approach taken by the bourgeois researchers to the history of sociology is manifested, as we know, in two ways. First, biographically, in which the development of sociology is presented as a succession of concepts formulated by individual philosophers. Secondly, as "sociological tradition," which emphasizes the evolutionary nature of sociological views. This even includes Marxist sociology, considered by bourgeois historians merely an aspect in the development of sociology, which has been left behind. They are thus trying to belittle the present scientific significance of Marxism.

The works under review entirely refute such prejudiced approaches on the basis of dialectical materialistic study of the main stages in the development of sociology in connection with the development of society. This exposes the groundlessness of the views shared by bourgeois ideologues on the development of sociology outside an objective historical context, as an evolution of "pure" ideas. The perfectly clear objective of such views is to suppress, to conceal the class function of bourgeois sociology and its apologetic nature.

Let us note that the works under review extensively deal with the relatively early stages in the development of bourgeois sociology. This is no accident, for foreign (non-Marxist above all) historical-sociological literature contains a number of conflicting interpretations of problems related to the interpretation of that period.

As we know, the "Communist Party Manifesto" played a tremendous role in the scientific interpretation of the processes of social life. This work by Marx and Engels was the result of their theoretical studies covering an entire age. The publication of the "Manifesto" alone could not fail to influence the then-existing and subsequently developed bourgeois sociological concepts. The evolutionism of Spencer and his followers, social Darwinism, the racial-anthropological school, the theory of conflict developed by L. Gumplovich and other directions in bourgeois sociology in the course of the entire "classical" period in its development (the second half of the 19th and beginning of the 20th centuries) were engaged, one way or another, in a steady, stubborn and irreconcilable struggle against Marxist sociohistorical views.

The study of the varieties of "reaction" on the part of "academic" bourgeois social science to Marxism assumes great importance. Many of its past "refuters" involve not only the familiar stereotype of caricatured "Marxism," which dominated bourgeois social science. Starting with the turn of the century, a number of attempts (some of them quite refined) were made on the part of leading bourgeois theoreticians (M. Weber, M. Scheller, K. Mannheim, A. Toynbee, P. Sorokin, T. Parsons and others) to pit "alternative" concepts against Marxist sociology. The works of Marx, Engels and Lenin are classical models of irreconcilable and aggressive arguments against such concepts, in the course of which a number of principles and categories of the scientific-materialistic theory of society were crystallized and developed. The study of neo-Kantianism and neopositivism and Lenin's substantiation of the principle of party-mindedness as a basic guideline in the social sciences provide

a convincing answer to anti-Marxist "arguments" in the sociological views of leading representatives of bourgeois social sciences in the past and their contemporary followers.

This is clearly the reason why, bearing in mind the position which the theoretical legacies of F. Tennis, M. Weber, H. Zimmel and E. Durkheim hold in their polemics with Marxism, particular attention has been paid to the study of their concepts in (1) and (2). Said concepts are considered here from the viewpoint of the historical changes which contributed to the theoretical re-orientation of bourgeois social science in the course of its tireless "dialogue" with Marxist philosophy. The mastery and reinterpretation of the theoretical legacy left by each one of those unquestionably important representatives of bourgeois sociology by their followers in Europe and the United States frequently took place under the sign of the adaptation of their "classical" ideas to later trends.

The definition of the significance and place of each one of the major theoreticians in the history of sociology is indeed an important task if we bear in mind the changes in the deployment of forces in academic sociology, related to the increased influence of critical trends (left-wing radical, "humanistic" and even "neo-Marxist"). The scientific solution of this problem is possible on the basis of the systematic interpretation of the dialectics of the interconnection between the objective (sociohistorical conditions) and the subjective (the specifics of the refraction of such conditions through the works of individual theoreticians) in the course of the historical-sociological process and the determination of the inner logic of the struggle and changes of ideas in sociological history.

All three works under review resolve this problem successfully, in our view. In addition to the concepts developed by bourgeois theoreticians of the "classical" period (which is the main topic of (1) and (2)), (3) analyzes the theory of "industrialism" and "post-industrialism," the concepts of the "idle class" and "society of abundance," and the theories of functional unity and social system, which appeared and are developing during the second half of the 20th century. The works also provide a description of sociological thinking in the leading capitalist countries such as the United States, Canada, Great Britain, France, Belgium, Switzerland, the FRG, Austria, Italy and Spain. Various articles and parts of collective monographs have been published and candidate dissertations defended on such questions. However, (3) is the first work of its kind to provide a summarized study of the topic in a separate monograph.

Unquestionably, the study of the contemporary concepts in bourgeois sociology is of the greatest interest today. The description of the leading scientific schools which have developed around concepts such as the theory of social action (structural functionalism), "industrialism" and "understanding" and psychoanalytical sociology, found in (2) and (3) are particularly apt and thorough. Each of the works presents its own angle in the assessment of such concepts. This avoids a duplication of critical material and enables the reader to gain a sufficiently complete and comprehensive idea on said schools.

The meaningful nature of the study and the accuracy of the assessments are among the merits of these works which, however, also suffer from a number of omissions. The development of sociology in European countries (particularly in Italy and Spain) found in (3) is extremely kaleidoscopic and, in some respects, even superficial. Naturally, we must point out that this shortcoming is explained by the still-narrow range covered by historical works on specific countries published here, which largely reveal the interest which researchers show in American, French and German sociology, i.e., in the sociology of countries in which it has been better studied compared with other countries. Extensive work remains to be done in this field. As was pointed out at the 10th World Sociological Congress (Mexico, 1982), today the problems of the national specifics of social development ways play an important role in the struggle between Marxist-Leninist and bourgeois sociologies.

Let us also note the excessively sketchy nature of many chapters in (1) and (2), which clearly show the lack of summing up sections and occasionally create the impression of an unjustified separation of the material by individual topic.

As a whole, the works under review are a successful attempt at describing the laws governing the development of bourgeois sociology, taking its polemics with Marxism into consideration. Unquestionably, these works are a timely and substantial scientific contribution to the study of the struggle of ideas between the two global social systems.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1983

5003

CSO: 1802/12

BOOKSHELF

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 6, Apr 83 p 128

[Text] 1. "60 Let Obrazovaniya Soyuza Sovetskikh Sotsialisticheskikh Respublik" [Sixty Years of the Founding of the USSR]. Joint ceremonious session of the CPSU Central Committee, USSR Supreme Soviet and RSFSR Supreme Soviet, 21-22 December 1982. Minutes. K. M. Bogolyubov in charge of publication. Politizdat, Moscow, 1983, 365 pp.

2. "60-Let Obrazovaniya SSSR" [Sixty Years of USSR]. Foreign greetings. O. B. Rakhmanin and A. S. Chernyayev in charge of publication. Politizdat, Moscow, 1983, 495 pp.

3. "Leninskaya Agrarnaya Politika KPSS" [The Leninist Agrarian Policy of the CPSU] Collection of the most important documents (August 1978-August 1982). M. S. Smiryukov and K. M. Bogolyubov, general editors. Politizdat, Moscow, 1983, 736 pp.

4. "XXVI S"yezd KPSS: Yedinstvo Teorii i Praktiki" [The 26th CPSU Congress: Unity of Theory and Practice]. Issue No 3. Politizdat, Moscow, 1983, 624 pp.

5. Andropov, Yu. V. "Ucheniye Karla Marks'a i Nekotoryye Voprosy Sotsialisticheskogo Stroitel'stva v SSSR" [Karl Marx's Theory and Some Problems of Building Socialism in the USSR]. Politizdat, Moscow, 1983, 31 pp.

6. "Leonid Il'ich Brezhnev." Recollections. Second expanded edition. Politizdat, 1983, 319 pp.

7. Romanov, G. V. "Izbrannyye Rechi i Stat'i" [Selected Speeches and Articles]. Second expanded edition. Politizdat, Moscow, 1983, 640 pp.

8. Artem (F. A. Sergeyev). "Stat'i, Rechi, Pis'ma" [Articles, Speeches, Letters]. A. D. Pedosov, head of editorial group. Politizdat, Moscow, 1983, 351 pp.

9. Asmolov, A. N. "Front v Tylu Vermakhta" [The Front Behind the Wehrmacht's Lines]. Second expanded edition, Politizdat, Moscow, 1983, 302 pp.

10. Bondar', V. Ya. "Leninskaya Partiya -- Partiya Novogo Tipa" [Lenin's Party -- A Party of a New Type]. Politizdat, Moscow, 1982, 287 pp.

11. "Vekhi Boyevoy Istorii" [Milestones of Battle History]. Sixty years of U. S. Communist Party. Translated from the English. Politizdat, Moscow, 1983, 367 pp.
12. "Voprosy Partiynoy Raboty v Svetе Resheniy XXVI S"yezda KPSS" [Problems of Party Work in the Light of the Resolutions of the 26th CPSU Congress]. Compiled by N. A. Zolotarev and A. M. Korolev. Politizdat, Moscow, 1982, 255 pp.
13. Glezerman, G. Ye. "Rozhdeniye Novogo Cheloveka" [Birth of the New Man]. Problems of shaping the individual under socialism. Politizdat, Moscow, 1982, 255 pp.
14. Grossu, S. K. "Sovetskaya Moldaviya" [Soviet Moldavia]. Politizdat, Moscow, 1982, 142 pp (In the United Fraternal Family).
15. Demirchyan, K. S. "Sovetskaya Armeniya" [Soviet Armenia]. Politizdat, Moscow, 1982, 136 pp (In the United Fraternal Family).
16. Kosolapov, R. I. "Vo Glave Kommunisticheskogo Stroitel'stva" [Heading the Building of Communism]. Znaniye, Moscow, 1983, 63 pp ("The CPSU -- the Vanguard of the Soviet People" Bookshelf).
17. "KPSS" [CPSU]. Reference. Fifth expanded and revised edition. D. I. Antonyuk, head of authors' group. Politizdat, Moscow, 1982, 446 pp.
18. Levin, L. A. "Sovetuyas' s Marksom..." [Council With Marx...]. Lenin -- student and disseminator of the works of Marx and Engels. Politizdat, Moscow, 1982, 272 pp.
19. Sventsitskiy, A. L. "Rukovoditel': Slovo i Delo" [The Manager: Word and Action] (Sociopsychological aspects). Politizdat, Moscow, 1983, 159 pp (Personality, Morality, Upbringing).
20. "Sotsialisticheskiy Internatsionalizm v Deystvii" [Socialist Internationalism in Action]. Based on the materials of the All-Union Practical Science Conference on "The Development of National Relations Under Mature Socialist Conditions. Experience and Problems in Patriotic and Internationalist Upbringing" (Riga, 28-30 June 1982). V. S. Buyanov, general editor. Nauka, Moscow, 1982, 145 pp.
21. Khalosha, B. M. "Voyenno-Politicheskiye Soyuzы Imperializma" [Imperialist Military-Political Alliances]. Main features and development trends in the 1980s-beginning of 1980s. Nauka, Moscow, 1982, 336 pp.
22. Tsetkin, Klara. "Iskusstvo-Ideologiya-Estetika" [Art-Ideology-Esthetics]. N. N. Sibiryakov, responsible editor. Iskusstvo, Moscow, 1982, 415 pp.
23. Sherdakov V. N. "Illyuziya Dobra" [The Illusion of Goodness]. Moral values and religious faith. Politizdat, Moscow, 1982, 287 pp.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1983

5003
CSO: 1802/12

END